arXiv:1610.03549v1 [math.AP] 11 Oct 2016

ON THE VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS TO A CLASS OF NONLINEAR DEGENERATE PARABOLIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

TILAK BHATTACHARYA AND LEONARDO MARAZZI

Abstract. In this work, we show existence and uniqueness of positive solutions of $H(Du, D^2u)+\chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = $ in $\Omega\times(0,T)$ and $u = h$ on its parabolic boundary. The operator H satisfies certain homogeneity conditions, $\Gamma > 0$ and depends on the degree of homogeneity of H, $f > 0$, increasing and meets a concavity condition. We also consider the case $f \equiv 1$ and prove existence of solutions without sign restrictions.

1. Introduction and statements of the main results

In this work, we address the issue of existence of viscosity solutions to a class of nonlinear degenerate parabolic differential equations. This could be viewed as a follow-up of the works in [1, 2, 3]. This class includes doubly nonlinear equations of the kind studied in these works. Our main goal has been to present a unified approach to studying as diverse group of equations as possible.

We now state the type of equations of interest to us. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a bounded domain and $T > 0$. Let $\partial\Omega$ denote its boundary and $\overline{\Omega}$ its closure. Call $\Omega_T = \Omega\times(0,T)$ and P_T its parabolic boundary.

We address existence and comparison principles for viscosity solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} &H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = 0, \text{ in } \Omega_T,\\ &u(x,0) = i(x),\ \forall x\in\Omega \text{ and } u(x,t) = j(x,t),\ \forall (x,t)\in P_T, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Gamma > 0$ is a constant, $\chi(t)$, $i(x)$, $j(x,t)$ and f are continuous and $f > 0$. Our work also includes the case $f \equiv 1$. The conditions on H are described below. In [1], H was the infinity-Laplacian and $f(u) = 3u^2$, and in [2, 3, 9], H was the p-Laplacian and $f(u) = (p-1)u^{p-2}$. Equations such as (1.1) have been studied in great detail in the weak solution setting, see the discussions in the works cited in [1], and [6].

We now state precisely the conditions placed on H and also state the main results of this work. Let o denote the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and, on occasions, we write a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n)$. Call S^n the set of all real $n\times n$ symmetric matrices. Let I be the $n\times n$ identity matrix and O the $n\times n$ matrix with all entries being zero. We reserve e to stand for a unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Keywords: degenerate, parabolic, viscosity solutions.

AMS Math Subject Classification 2010: 35K65, 35K55.

Through out the work we require that $H \in C(\mathbb{R}^n \times S^n, \mathbb{R})$ and $H(p, O) = 0,\ \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We now describe the conditions that H satisfies.

Condition A (Monotonicity): The operator $H(p, X)$ is continuous at $p = 0$ for any $X \in S^n$ and $H(p, O) = 0$, for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In addition, for any $X,\ Y \in S^n$ with $X \leq Y$,

$$H(p, X) \leq H(p, Y), \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{1.2}$$

Since $H(p, O) = 0$, $H(p, X) \geq 0$, for any p and any $X \geq 0$. $\square$

Condition B (Homogeneity): We assume that there are constants k_1, a positive real number, and k_2, a positive odd integer, such that for any $(p, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times S^n$,

$$H(\theta p, X) = |\theta|^{k_1} H(p, X), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{and} \quad H(p, \theta X) = \theta^{k_2} H(p, X), \quad \forall \theta > 0. \tag{1.3}$$

While our work allows $k_2 \geq 1$, we consider, mainly, the case $k_1 = 1$. Define

$$k = k_1 + k_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = k_1 + 2k_2. \tag{1.4}$$

If $k_2 = 1$ then $k = k_1 + 1$ and $\gamma = k_1 + 2$. $\square$

For the third condition, observe that $(e \otimes e)_{ij} = e_i e_j$ and $e \otimes e$ is a non-negative definite matrix. For every $-\infty < \lambda < \infty$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} &m_{min}(\lambda) = \min_{|e|=1} H\left(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e\right), \quad m_{max}(\lambda) = \max_{|e|=1} H\left(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e\right), \\ &\mu_{min}(\lambda) = \min_{|e|=1} H(e, \lambda e \otimes e - I) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{max}(\lambda) = \max_{|e|=1} H(e, \lambda e \otimes e - I). \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

By (1.2), the functions $m_{min}(\lambda)$ and $m_{max}(\lambda)$ are decreasing in λ while $\mu_{min}(\lambda)$ and $\mu_{max}(\lambda)$ are increasing in λ.

If $\lambda < 1$ then $I - \lambda \times e$ is a positive definite matrix and $m_{max}(\lambda) \geq m_{min}(\lambda) \geq 0$. Also, if H is odd in X then $m_{max}(\lambda) = -\mu_{min}(\lambda)$ and $m_{min}(\lambda) = -\mu_{max}(\lambda)$. However, in this work we do not require that H be odd in X.

We set

$$m(\lambda) = \min\left\{m_{min}(\lambda),\ -\mu_{max}(\lambda)\right\} \ \text{ and } \ \mu(\lambda) = \max\left\{m_{max}(\lambda),\ -\mu_{min}(\lambda)\right\}. \tag{1.6}$$

Condition C (Coercivity): We take H to be coercive in the following sense. We impose that there are λ_0 and λ_1 such that $-\infty < 0 < \lambda_1 \leq 1 \leq \lambda_0 < \infty$ and

$$\text{(i)}\ \ m(\lambda) > 0, \ \ \forall \lambda \leq \lambda_1, \ \ \text{and} \ \ \text{(ii)}\ \ \mu(\lambda) < 0, \ \ \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0. \quad \square \tag{1.7}$$

Since $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) \geq 0$, if $\lambda \leq 1$, we distinguish between the following two cases.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Case (i): there is a } \bar{\lambda} \text{ such that } 1 < \bar{\lambda} < 2 \text{ such that } \mu(\bar{\lambda}) < 0, \\ &\text{Case (ii): there is a } \bar{\lambda} \geq 2 \text{ such that } \mu(\lambda) < 0,\ \forall \lambda > \bar{\lambda}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

The quantity $\bar{\lambda}$ in Case (ii) is minimal in the sense that $\mu(\lambda) \geq 0$, if $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$.

Define $\hat{H}(p, X) = -H(p, -X),\ \forall (p, X) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times S^n$. We make an observation regarding $\hat{H}$.

Remark 1.1. It is clear that $\hat{H}$ satisfies Conditions A and B, see (1.2) and (1.3). Next, using definitions analogous to (1.5) and calling $\hat{m}_{min},\ \hat{m}_{max},\ \hat{\mu}_{min}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{max}$ the corresponding quantities for $\hat{H}$, we find that

$$\hat{m}_{min}(\lambda) = -\mu_{max}(\lambda), \quad \hat{m}_{max}(\lambda) = -\mu_{min}(\lambda), \quad \hat{\mu}_{min}(\lambda) = -m_{max}(\lambda)$$
$$\text{and } \hat{\mu}_{max}(\lambda) = -m_{min}(\lambda), \quad \forall \lambda \in I\!R.$$

It is clear that $\hat{m}(\lambda) = m(\lambda)$ and $\hat{\mu}(\lambda) = \mu(\lambda)$. Thus, $\hat{H}$ satisfies Condition C or (1.7). □

From hereon, we define

$$h(x,t) = \begin{cases} i(x), & \forall x \in \Omega, \text{ at } t = 0, \\ j(x,t), & \forall (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T). \end{cases}$$

We assume that $i(x)$ and $j(x,t)$ are continuous and $h \in C(P_T)$, i.e, $\lim_{x\to y} i(x) = j(y,0) = \lim_{(z,t)\to(y,0^+)} j(z,t)$, where $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $(z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0,T)$.

We now state the main results of the work. Recall (1.3) and (1.4).

Theorem 1.2. *Let H satisfy Conditions A, B and C and $0 < T < \infty$. Assume that $\chi : [0,T] \to I\!R$ and $f : [0,\infty) \to I\!R,\ f \geq 0$ are continuous.*

Assume further that Case(i) of (1.8) holds and $\Omega \subset I\!R^n,\ n \geq 2$, is any bounded domain. Consider the following problem:

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t, \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T.$$

I. Let $k > 1$ and $h > 0$. Suppose that f is non-constant, C^1, increasing and $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave. If $\Gamma = k$ then the above problem admits a unique positive solution $u \in C(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$.

II. Let $k \geq 1$ and $f \equiv 1$. If $0 < \Gamma < \gamma$ then the above admits a unique solution $u \in C(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let H satisfy Conditions A, B and C and $0 < T < \infty$. Assume that $\chi : [0,T] \to I\!R$ and $f : [0,\infty) \to I\!R,\ f \geq 0$ are continuous.*

Assume further that Case(ii) of (1.8) holds and $\Omega \subset I\!R^n,\ n \geq 2$, is a bounded domain that satisfies a uniform exterior ball condition.. Consider the following problem:

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t, \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T.$$

I. Let $k > 1$ and $h > 0$. Suppose that f is non-constant, C^1, increasing and $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave. If $\Gamma = k$ then the above problem admits a unique positive solution $u \in C(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$.

II. Let $k \geq 1$ and $f \equiv 1$. If $0 < \Gamma < \gamma$ then the above admits a unique solution $u \in C(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$.

The two Part I's of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 address the doubly nonlinear case. We prove both parts I and II by taking $h > 0$. In II, since adding constants to a solution yields a solution we get the claim for any h. The condition $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is required for a comparison principle to hold, see Section 4 and it is not clear to us if a version of the comparison principle holds

if the condition fails to hold. The proof of the existence employs the Perron method and a substantial part of the work is devoted to the construction of appropriate sub-solutions and super-solutions. These are so done that they are close to the boundary data h in P_T in a local sense. Section 5 contains the details for the initial data while Sections 6 and 7 has details for the side condition. We also remark that some of our results hold for more general operators H. However, to keep our presentation clear, we have taken H to be as described above and made remarks and comments along the way where needed.

We point out that the work in [5] also addresses issues that overlap with our work. In this work, besides homogeneity, H satisfies $\forall (x,p,Y) \in \Omega \times I\!R^n \times S^n$, where

$$a|p|^{k_1} Trace(X) \leq H(x,p,Y+X) - H(x,p,Y) \leq b|p|^{k_1} Trace(X), \ \ \forall X \in S^n, \ X \geq 0, \tag{1.9}$$

where $0 < a \leq b < \infty$ and $k_1 > -1$. Thus, $k = k_1 + 1$ and $\gamma = k_1 + 2$. The author considers equations of the type

$$H(x, Du, D^2u) + \langle \chi(t), Du \rangle |Du|^{k_1} - u_t = g(x,t), \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T. \tag{1.10}$$

where H and χ satisfy additional conditions in x and x and t. The work contains a comparison principle and regularity results under further conditions on f and h. The author also shows existence of solutions of the above in domains with exterior cone condition. Clearly, singular cases are also included. We direct the reader to the work for a more detailed discussion.

We now compare and contrast [5] with the current work. The condition in (1.9) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \ \ a(t-s) \leq H(x,e,I - se\otimes e) - H(x,e,I-te\otimes e) \leq b(t-s), \ t \geq s, \ \text{ and} \\ &(ii) \ a \leq \frac{H(x,e,I-e\otimes e)}{n-1} \leq b. \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

Our conditions require that $H(p, X+Y) \geq H(p,X)$, for $Y \geq 0$, and coercivity as stated in condition C. Thus, $H(e, I - se\otimes e)$ is continuous and non-increasing in s (see condition A), (1.3) and (1.7) hold. The last two conditions are also satisfied by the operators in [5]. However, we do not require that H be Lipschitz continuous, see (1.11)(i). Also, unlike (1.11)(ii), we allow the possibility that $H(e, I - e\otimes e) = 0$ (as in the case of the infinity-Laplacian). See Section 3 for examples. Our work also addresses the doubly nonlinear case where $f(u) \not\equiv 1$. The second term involving the gradient, in the doubly nonlinear case, has the same power as in (1.10). However, we allow a greater range of powers if $f \equiv 1$, see Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

As an example, we take an example like Trudinger's equation, i.e, take $\chi = 0$ in parts I of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, $k_1 = p-2$, $p \geq 2$, $k_2 = 1$ and $f(u) = u^{p-2}$,

$$\text{div}\left(|Du|^{p-2}Du\right) + \chi(t)|Du|^{p-1} - (p-1)u^{p-2}u_t = 0, \ u > 0,$$

If we make a change of variables $v = \log u$ (see Lemma 2.3) we get

$$\text{div}\left(|Dv|^{p-2}Dv\right) + (p-1)|Dv|^p + \chi(t)|Dv|^{p-1} - (p-1)v_t = 0,$$

where v can have any sign. Both are addressed in this work.

However. our work takes $g = 0$ (see (1.10)) and while Theorem 1.2 applies to any general domain, Theorem 1.3 is proven for domains with exterior ball condition. We do not address any regularity results and the operator H does not depend on x although the results here would hold (modifying the definitions appropriately) if it depended on t.

We describe the layout of the paper. Section 2 contains additional notations, definitions and some auxiliary results. Sections 3 lists examples of H covered by the work. We prove various versions of the comparison principle in Section 4. Sections 5, 6 and 7 provide details of the constructions of the sub-solutions and super-solutions and lead to the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. These lead to the existence of a unique solution by using Perron's method. In the Appendix, we have included a version of the weak maximum principle.

2. **Notations, definitions and preliminary results**

Through out this work, $\Omega \subset I\!R^n,\ n \geq 2$, is a bounded domain and $\partial\Omega$ its boundary. For $0 < T < \infty$, we define the cylinder

$$\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0,T) = \{(x,t) \in I\!R^n \times I\!R :\ x \in \Omega,\ 0 < t < T\}. \tag{2.1}$$

The parabolic boundary of Ω_T, denoted by P_T, is the set

$$P_T = (\Omega \times \{0\}) \cup (\partial\Omega \times [0,T)). \tag{2.2}$$

Let $B_r(x) \subset I\!R^n$ be the ball of radius r, centered at x. For $r > 0$ and $\tau > 0$, we define the following open cylinder

$$D_{r,\tau}(x,t) = B_r(x) \times (t-\tau, t+\tau)\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Our goal in this work is to show existence of positive solutions of

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^{\Gamma} - f(u)u_t = 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T, \text{ and } u = h, \text{ in } P_T, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\chi : [0,T] \times \Omega \to I\!R^n$ is continuous, $\Gamma \geq 0$, f is C^1, $f > 0$ and

$$h(x,t) = \begin{cases} i(x), & \forall x \in \Omega, \text{ at } t = 0, \\ j(x,t), & \forall (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T). \end{cases}$$

We assume that $i(x)$ and $j(x,t)$ are continuous and $h \in C(P_T)$, i.e, $\lim_{x\to y} i(x) = j(y,0) = \lim_{(z,t)\to(y,0^+)} j(z,t)$, where $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $(z,t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0,T)$.

For a set $A \subset I\!R^{n+1}$, the function class $usc(A)$ is the set of all functions that are upper semi-continuous on A. Similarly, $lsc(A)$ is the set of all functions that are lower semi-continuous on A.

We discuss the notion of a viscosity sub-solution and a super-solution of the parabolic equation

$$H(Dw, D^2w) + \chi(t)|Dw|^{\Gamma} - f(w)w_t = 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T. \tag{2.5}$$

For these definitions, we assume that H satisfies Condition A, see (1.2), and f is a continuous function of one variable and $f > 0$.

Through out this work, by a test function ψ we mean a function that is C^2 in x and C^1 in t.

We say that $u \in usc(\Omega_T)$ is a sub-solution of (2.5) in Ω_T if for any test function ψ such that $u - \psi$ has a maximum at a point $(y, s) \in \Omega_T$, we have

$$H(D\psi(y,s), D^2\psi(y,s)) + \chi(s)|D\psi(y,s)|^\Gamma - f(u(y,s))(\psi_t)(y,s) \geq 0. \tag{2.6}$$

In this case, we write $H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t \geq 0$. A function $v \in lsc(\Omega_T)$ is a super-solution of (2.5) in Ω_T if for any test function ψ such that $v - \psi$ has a minimum at a point $(y, s) \in \Omega_T$, we have

$$H(D\psi(y,s), D^2\psi(y,s)) + \chi(s)|D\psi(y,s)|^\Gamma - f(v(y,s))(\psi_t)(y,s) \leq 0. \tag{2.7}$$

In this case, we write $H(Dv, D^2v) + \chi(t)|Dv|^\Gamma - f(v)v_t \leq 0$. If u is a sub-solution and a super-solution of (2.5) then $u \in C(\Omega_T)$ and is a solution of (2.5) in Ω_T.

Next, u is a sub-solution of (2.4) if $u \in usc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$, u is a sub-solution of (2.5) and $u \leq h$ in P_T. Similarly, u is a super-solution of (2.4) if $u \in lsc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$, u is a super-solution of (2.5) and $u \geq h$ in P_T. We say u is a solution of (2.4) if $u \in C(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$, u is a solution of (2.5) and $u = h$.

In this work, we construct sub-solutions and super-solutions that utilize C^2 functions of x and t. With (2.4) in mind, we state an expression for the operator H and this will be applied quite frequently in this work. Let $A(t) > 0$ and $v(x)$ be a C^2 function. Using (1.3) and (1.4),

$$H(DAv, D^2Av) = A^k H(Dv, D^2v). \tag{2.8}$$

Let $v(x) = v(r)$ where $r = |x - z|$, for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Set $e = (e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_n)$ where $e_i = (x - z)_i/r$, $\forall i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Then for $x \neq z$,

$$H(Dv, D^2v + dDv \otimes Dv) = H\left(v'(r)e, \left(\frac{v'}{r}\right) I + \left(v'' + d\left(v'\right)^2 - \frac{v'}{r}\right) e \otimes e\right), \tag{2.9}$$

where I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $d = 0$ or 1. We now take $d = 0$ and use Condition B. If $v' \geq 0$ then (2.9) shows that

$$H(Dv, D^2v) = \frac{(v')^k}{r^{k_2}} H\left(e,\ I + \left(\frac{rv''}{v'} - 1\right) e \otimes e\right). \tag{2.10}$$

If $v' \leq 0$ then (2.9) leads to

$$H(Dv, D^2v) = \frac{|v'|^k}{r^{k_2}} H\left(e,\ -\left(I + \left(\frac{rv''}{v'} - 1\right) e \otimes e\right)\right), \tag{2.11}$$

We apply (2.10) and (2.11) to the function $v(r) = a + br^\beta$ where $a + br^\beta > 0$. We note

$$\frac{rv''}{v'} - 1 = \beta - 2. \tag{2.12}$$

Using (2.10), (2.12) and recalling that $k = k_1 + k_2$ and $\gamma = k_1 + 2k_2$ (see (1.4)), we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(Dv, D^2v) &= r^{-k_2}\left(b\beta r^{\beta-1}\right)^k H(e,\ I + (\beta-2)e\otimes e) \\ &= (b\beta)^k\, r^{\beta k-\gamma} H(e,\ I-(2-\beta)e\otimes e), \quad \text{if } b\beta>0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Similarly, using (2.11) and (2.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(Dv, D^2v + Dv\otimes Dv) &= r^{-k_2}\left(|b\beta| r^{\beta-1}\right)^k H(e,\ -I-(\beta-2)e\otimes e) \\ &= (|b\beta|)^k\, r^{\beta k-\gamma} H(e,\ (2-\beta)e\otimes e - I), \quad \text{if } b\beta<0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Remark 2.1. In this work, we take $d = 0$ and we make use of (2.13) and (2.14) in Sections 5, 6 and 7.

The expressions in (2.9)-(2.14) hold if H depends on $t,\ u,\ Du$ and D^2u. However, to keep our exposition clearer, we will take H to depend on Du and D^2u and make comments about more general situations as and when the need arises. □

Remark 2.2. Recall (1.6), (2.13) and (2.14). Let $v = a + br^\beta$ then the following hold.

$$\text{(i)} \qquad \frac{(b\beta)^k m(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} \le H(Dv, D^2v) \le \frac{(b\beta)^k\,\mu(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}, \quad \text{if } b\beta>0.$$

$$\text{(ii)} \quad -\frac{(|b\beta|)^k\,\mu(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} \le H(Dv, D^2v) \le -\frac{(|b\beta|)^k\, m(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}, \quad \text{if } b\beta<0.$$

We make use of the above observations in Sections 5, 6 and 7. □

We now discuss a change of variables formula needed for a version of the comparison principle for equations of the kind

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = 0,$$

where $\chi : [0,T] \to I\!R$ is continuous. In this work, we take (a) $\Gamma = k$ for a non-constant f and $k > 1$, and (b) any $0 < \Gamma < \gamma$, for $f \equiv 1$ and $k \ge 1$. Recall that $\gamma = k_1 + 2k_2$, see (1.4).

Let $f : I\!R \to I\!R,\ f > 0$, be a C^1 function. Recall the definition of k from (1.3). For $k > 1$, define $\phi : I\!R \to I\!R$ by a C^2 solution of

$$\frac{d\phi}{d\tau} = \{(f\circ\phi)(\tau)\}^{1/(k-1)} \tag{2.15}$$

Thus, ϕ is increasing. For proving the comparison principle in Section 4, we will assume further that

$$f^{1/(k-1)} \text{ is concave, i.e, } \left\{f^{1/(k-1)}\right\}'(s) \text{ is non-increasing in } s. \tag{2.16}$$

Combining (2.15) and (2.16) the above reads

$$\frac{d\log\phi'(\tau)}{d\tau} = \frac{\phi''(\tau)}{\phi'(\tau)} = \left[\frac{f'(\phi(\tau))}{(k-1)}\right]\{(f\circ\phi)(\tau)\}^{(2-k)/(k-1)} \text{ is non-increasing in } \tau.$$

The facts that f is positive and $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave impose restrictions on the domain of f. From hereon, for all the main results we take

$$f \text{ is defined on } [c,\infty),\ c \geq 0,\ f > 0 \text{ and } f \text{ is increasing.}$$

We now prove the following change of variables lemma. We do this for a somewhat more general case. We do not require that (2.16) hold.

Lemma 2.3. *Let H satisfy Conditions A and B, see (1.2) and (1.3), $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\chi : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous.*

Let k be as in (1.4), $\tilde{f}(v) = \{(f \circ \phi)(v)\}^{k/(k-1)}$ and $\tilde{g}(x,t,v) = g(x,t,\phi(v))$.

Case (i): Suppose that $k > 1$, $f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a C^1 function and ϕ is as in (2.15). We assume that f is non-constant.

(a) If $u \in usc(\Omega_T)$, $u > 0$, solves $H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^k + g(x,t,u) \geq f(u)u_t$ in Ω_T and $v = \phi^{-1}(u)$ then $v \in usc(\Omega_T)$ and

$$H\left(Dv, D^2v + \frac{\phi''(v)}{\phi'(v)} Dv \otimes Dv\right) + \chi(t)|Dv|^k + \frac{\tilde{g}(x,t,v)}{\tilde{f}(v)} \geq v_t, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T.$$

The converse also holds.

(b) If $u \in lsc(\Omega_T)$, $u > 0$, solves $H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^k + g(x,t,u) \leq f(u)u_t$ in Ω_T and $v = \phi^{-1}(u)$ then $v \in lsc(\Omega_T)$ and

$$H\left(Dv, D^2v + \frac{\phi''(v)}{\phi'(v)} Dv \otimes Dv\right) + \chi(t)|Dv|^k + \frac{\tilde{g}(x,t,v)}{\tilde{f}(v)} \leq v_t, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

and conversely.

Case (ii): Let $k = 1$. If $f \equiv 1$ then the claims in (a) and (b) hold if $\phi(\tau)$ is any increasing positive C^2 function. In particular, if $\phi(\tau) = e^\tau$ then $H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du| + g(x,t,u) - u_t \geq (\leq) 0$ if and only if

$$H(Dv, D^2v + Dv \otimes Dv) + \chi(t)|Dv| + \frac{\tilde{g}(x,t,v)}{\phi'(v)} - v_t \geq (\leq) 0.$$

Proof. We prove Case (i) part (a) and start with the converse. Let ϕ be as in (2.15) and $v \in usc(\Omega_T)$ solve

$$H\left(Dv, D^2v + \frac{\phi''(v)}{\phi'(v)} Dv \otimes Dv\right) + \chi(t)|Dv|^k + \frac{\tilde{g}(x,t,v)}{\tilde{f}(v)} - v_t \geq 0.$$

Take $u = \phi(v)$ and ψ to be a test function such that $u - \psi$ has a maximum at a point $(y,s) \in \Omega_T$. Clearly,

$$v(x,t) \leq \phi^{-1}\left(\, u(y,s) + \psi(x,t) - \psi(y,s) \,\right), \quad \forall (x,t) \in \Omega_T.$$

Calling $\zeta(x,t) = \phi^{-1}\left(\, u(y,s) + \psi(x,t) - \psi(y,s) \,\right)$, we get $(v - \zeta)(x,t) \leq (v - \zeta)(y,s) = 0$. Thus, $v - \zeta$ has a maximum at (y,s) and hence,

(2.17)

$$H\left(D\zeta(y,s), \left(D^2\zeta + \frac{\phi''(v)}{\phi'(v)} D\zeta \otimes D\zeta\right)(y,s)\right) + \chi(y,s)|D\zeta(y,s)|^k + \frac{\tilde{g}(y,s,v(y,s))}{\tilde{f}(v(y,s))} - \zeta_t(y,s) \geq 0.$$

We note

$$D\zeta(y,s)=\frac{D\psi(y,s)}{\phi'(\zeta(y,s))},\qquad \zeta_t(y,s)=\frac{\psi_t(y,s)}{\phi'(\zeta(y,s))}\quad\text{and}$$
$$D^2\zeta(y,s)=\frac{D^2\psi(y,s)}{\phi'(\zeta(y,s))}-\left[\frac{\phi''(\zeta(y,s))}{(\phi'(\zeta(y,s))}\right]D\zeta(y,s)\otimes D\zeta(y,s).$$

Recalling that $\zeta(y,s)=v(y,s)$ and using the above, we get

$$\frac{D^2\psi(y,s)}{\phi'(v(y,s))}=D^2\zeta(y,s)+\frac{\phi''(v(y,s))}{\phi'(v(y,s))}D\zeta(y,s)\otimes D\zeta(y,s). \tag{2.18}$$

Using (1.3), (2.18) and the definitions of $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$, we get from (2.17)

$$0\le H\left(\frac{D\psi(y,s)}{\phi'(v(y,s))},\ \frac{D^2\psi(y,s)}{\phi'(v(y,s))}\right)+\chi(s)\left(\frac{|D\psi(y,s)|}{\phi'(v(y,s))}\right)^k+\frac{g(y,s,u(y,s))}{\{f(u(y,s))\}^{k/(k-1)}}-\frac{\psi_t(y,s)}{\phi'(v(y,s))},$$
$$=\frac{H\left(D\psi(y,s),\ D^2\psi(y,s)\right)}{\{\phi'(v(y,s))\}^k}+\chi(s)\left(\frac{|D\psi(y,s)|}{\phi'(v(y,s))}\right)^k+\frac{g(y,s,u(y,s))}{\{f(u(y,s))\}^{k/(k-1)}}-\frac{\psi_t(y,s)}{\phi'(v(y,s))}.$$

Using (2.15), we get $H(Du,D^2u)+\chi(t)|Du|^k+g(x,t,u)-f(u)u_t\ge 0$.

Suppose that $u\in usc(\Omega_T)$ solve $H(Du,D^2u)+\chi(t)|Du|^k+g(x,t,u)-f(u)u_t\ge 0$. Define $v=\phi^{-1}(u)$.

Let ψ be a test function such that $v-\psi$ has a maximum at (y,s), i.e, $v(x,t)\le v(y,s)+\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,s),\ \forall(x,t)\in\Omega_T$. Thus,

$$u(x,t)\le\phi(\ v(y,s)+\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,s)\ ),\ \ \forall(x,t)\in\Omega_T.$$

Let $\eta(x,t)=\phi(\ v(y,s)+\psi(x,t)-\psi(y,s)\ )$ implying that $\eta(y,s)=u(y,s)$, $(u-\eta)(x,t)\le(u-\eta)(y,s)=0$ and $H(D\eta(u,s),D^2\eta(y,s))-f(u(y,s))\eta_t(y,s)\ge 0$. Calculating,

$$D\eta(y,s)=\phi'(v(y,s))D\psi(y,s),\qquad \eta_t(y,s)=\phi'(v(y,s))\psi_t(y,s)\quad\text{and}$$
$$D^2\eta(y,s)=\phi'(v(y,s))D^2\psi(y,s)+\phi''(v(y,s))D\psi(y,s)\otimes D\psi(y,s).$$

Using the above and (1.3) we get

$$0\le H(D\eta(y,s),D^2\eta(y,s))+\chi(s)|D\eta(y,s)|^k+g(y,s,u(y,s))-f(u(y,s))\eta_t(y,s)$$
$$=[\phi'(v(y,s))]^kH\left(D\psi(y,s),D^2\psi(y,s)+\frac{\psi''(v(y,s))}{\psi'(v(y,s))}D\psi(y,s)\otimes D\psi(y,s)\right)$$
$$+\chi(s)[\phi'(v(y,s))]^k|D\psi(y,s)|^k+g(y,s,(\phi\circ v)(y,s))-(f\circ\phi\circ v)(y,s)\phi'(v(y,s))\psi_t.$$

Simplifying, we see that the claim holds. The claims in Case (i) (b) and Case (ii) follow analogously. □

Remark 2.4. (i) Lemma 2.3 does not address the case $f\equiv 1$ and $k>1$ since the comparison principle for for $H(Du,D^2u)+\chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma-u_t=0$, where $\Gamma\ge 0$, follows from a general result. See Section 4.

(ii) By Condition B (see(1.3)), $H(p,\theta X)=\theta^{k_2}H(p,X),\ \theta>0$. Taking θp in place of p in $H(p,X+p\otimes p)$ and taking $X=0$, we get $H(\theta p,\theta^2p\otimes p)=\theta^{k_1+2k_2}H(p,p\otimes p)$. For example,

take $H = \operatorname{div}(|Du|^{q-2}Du),\ q \geq 2$, and consider the differential equation $H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^{q-1} - (q-1)u^{q-2}u_t = 0,\ u > 0$. Then $H(p, X + p \otimes p) = H(p, X) + (q-1)|p|^q$ and taking $v = \log u$, Lemma 2.3(ii) transforms this to

$$H(Dv, D^2v) + (q-1)|Dv|^q + \chi(t)|Dv|^{q-1} - (q-1)v_t = 0.$$

Thus, showing existence for the former implies existence for the above. See Section 3. □

Remark 2.5. It is clear from Lemma 2.3 that analogous results hold if H satisfies Condition A and B and depends on $x,\ t,\ u,\ Du$ and D^2u. □

Finally, we state a lemma that will be used Sections 5, 6 and 7. Note that the result holds if H depends on $t,\ u,\ Du,\ D^2u$ and $H(t, u, Du, O) = 0$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $O \subset \Omega_T$ be a sub-domain, $\Gamma \geq 0$, $\ell : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\chi : [0,T]$ and $\Lambda : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ all be continuous. Assume that H satisfies Condition A, see (1.2). Suppose that $u \in usc(lsc)(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$ satisfies*

$$H(Du, D^2u + \ell(u)Du \otimes Du) + \chi(t)|Du|^{\Gamma} - f(u)u_t \geq (\leq)0, \quad \text{in } O \cap \Omega_T.$$

Assume that for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $u \geq (\leq)c$ in O, $u = c$ on $\partial O \cap \Omega_T$, and $u = c$ in $\Omega_T \setminus O$. Then u satisfies

$$H(Du, D^2u + \ell(u)Du \otimes Du) + \chi(t)|Du|^{\Gamma} - f(u)u_t \geq (\leq)0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T.$$

Proof. We prove the statement when u is a sub-solution. We check at points on $\partial O \cap \Omega_T$.

Let $(y, \tau) \in \partial O \cap \Omega_T$, with $\tau > 0$. Suppose that ψ, a test function, such that $u - \psi$ has a maximum at (y, τ). Since $u \geq c$ and $u(y, \tau) = c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq u(x,t) - u(y,\tau) &\leq \langle D\psi(y,\tau), x-y\rangle + \psi_t(y,\tau)(t-\tau) + \frac{\langle D^2\psi(y,\tau)(x-y), x-y\rangle}{2} \\ &+ o(|x-y|^2 + |t-\tau|), \end{aligned}$$

as $(x,t) \to (y,\tau)$. Clearly, $D\psi(y,\tau) = 0$, $\psi_t(y,\tau) = 0$ and $D^2\psi(y,\tau) \geq 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} H\left(D\psi(y,\tau), D^2\psi(y,\tau) + \ell(u(y,\tau))D\psi(y,\tau) \otimes D\psi(y,\tau)\right) \\ +\chi(\tau)|D\psi(y,\tau)|^{\Gamma} - f(\psi(y,\tau))(\psi_t)(y,\tau) \\ = H(0, D^2\psi(y,\tau)) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion holds. The proof when u is a super-solution is analogous. □

3. Examples of H

In this section, we list examples of operators H that satisfy Conditions A, B and C and are included in the class of operators to which our results apply. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $|e| = 1$. Set $r = |x|,\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Recall the definitions of $k_1,\ k_2,\ k,\ m(\lambda)$ and $\mu(\lambda)$ from (1.3), (1.4), (1.6) and (1.7).

Example 1: The p-Laplacian and the pseudo p-Laplacian. Recall that the p-Laplacian Δ_p, for $p \geq 2$, is $D_p u = |Du|^{p-2}\Delta u + (p-2)|Du|^{p-4}\Delta_\infty u$, where $\Delta_\infty u = \sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i u D_j u D_{ij} u$ is the infinity-Laplacian. We consider a some what more general version. Define

$$H(Du, D^2u) = |Du|^q \Delta u + a|Du|^{q-2}\Delta_\infty u,$$

where $q \geq 0$ and $a > -1$. Then $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = n + a - \lambda(1+a)$. Taking $\hat{\lambda} < (n+a)/(1+a)$ and noting that $n \geq 2$, $m(\hat{\lambda}) = -\mu(\hat{\lambda}) > 0$, since H is odd. Clearly, Conditions A, B and C are met.

Next we discuss a version of the pseudo p-Laplacian, denoted by $\Delta^s_{p,q}$, where

$$H(Du, D^2u) = \Delta^s_{p,q} u = |Du|^q \sum_{i=1}^n |D_i u|^p D_{ii} u, \text{ where } p,\ q \geq 0.$$

Thus, $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^p - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2}$ and $H > 0$, if $\lambda \leq 0$.

Let $\lambda > 0$. Note that $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) \geq (1-\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^p$, since $|e_i| \leq 1$. By Hölder's inequality, if $r \geq 0$ then

$$\min\left(1,\ n^{(2-r)/2}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^r \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{r+2}\right)^{r/(r+2)} n^{2/(r+2)}. \tag{3.1}$$

Apply (3.1) with $r = p$ to get a lower bound for H, that is,

$$H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^p - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2} \geq (1-\lambda)\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^p \geq \begin{cases} (1-\lambda)n^{-|2-p|/2}, & 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1, \\ 1-\lambda, & \lambda \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Set $A = (\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2})^{p/(p+2)}$. Use (3.1) first with $r = p$ and then with $r = p+2$ to get an upper bound for H, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) &= \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^p - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2} \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2}\right)^{p/(p+2)} n^{2/(p+2)} - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2} \\ &\leq A\left[n^{2/(p+2)} - \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2}\right)^{2/(p+2)}\right] \leq A\left[n^{2/(p+2)} - \frac{\lambda}{n^{p/(p+2)}}\right] = A\left(\frac{n-\lambda}{n^{p/(p+2)}}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{p+2}}{n}\right)^{p/(p+2)} (n-\lambda) \leq I(\lambda)\,(n-\lambda)\,, \end{aligned}$$

where $I(\lambda) = 1$, if $\lambda \leq n$, and $I(\lambda) = n^{-p/2}$, if $\lambda \geq n$. Observe that if $e_i = 1$, for some i, then $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = 1 - \lambda$. Also, if $e_i = n^{-1/2}$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, \cdots, n$, and then $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = n^{-p/2}(n - \lambda)$. Conditions A, B and C hold.

Example 2: The ∞-Laplacian and a related operator. Setting $H(Du, D^2u) := \Delta_\infty u = \sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i u D_j u D_{ij} u$, we get $H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = 1 - \lambda$.

Next, we consider $q \geq 0$ and define $H(Du, D^2u) := \sum_{i,j=1}^n |D_iu|^q |D_ju|^q D_iu D_ju D_{ij}u$. Then

$$H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{2q+2} - \lambda \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{q+2} \right)^2.$$

If $\lambda \leq 0$ then $H > 0$. Taking $\lambda \geq 0$ and observing that $(\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{q+2})^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{2q+2}$, we get

$$H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) \geq (1-\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{2q+2} \geq \begin{cases} (1-\lambda) n^{-q}, & 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1, \\ 1 - \lambda, & \lambda \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Noting that $\sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{2q+2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{q+2}$ and using (3.1), we get

$$H(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{q+2} \left(1 - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n |e_i|^{q+2} \right) \leq I(\lambda) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{n^{q/2}} \right),$$

where $I(\lambda) = 1$, if $\lambda \leq n^{q/2}$ and $I(\lambda) = n^{-q/2}$, if $\lambda \geq n^{q/2}$. Conditions A, B and C are satisfied.

Example 3: Pucci operators. Let $a_i,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, denote the eigenvalues of the matrix D^2u.

For $0 < \theta \leq \vartheta$ and $q \geq 0$ define

$$M^{+,q}_{\theta,\vartheta}(u) = |Du|^q \left(\vartheta \sum_{a_i \geq 0} a_i + \theta \sum_{a_i \leq 0} a_i \right) \quad \text{and} \quad M^{-,q}_{\theta,\vartheta}(u) = |Du|^q \left(\theta \sum_{a_i \geq 0} a_i + \vartheta \sum_{a_i \leq 0} a_i \right).$$

For any e with $|e| = 1$, the eigenvalues of $I - \lambda e \otimes e$ are 1, with multiplicity $n-1$, and $1-\lambda$. Set $H^{\pm}(Du, D^2u) = M^{\pm,q}_{\theta,\vartheta}(u)$ and observe that $H^+(e, \pm(I - \lambda e \otimes e)) = -H^-(e, \mp(I - \lambda e \otimes e))$. Clearly,

$$H^+(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = \begin{cases} \vartheta(n - \lambda), & \lambda \leq 1, \\ \vartheta(n-1) + \theta(1-\lambda), & \lambda \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad H^-(e, I - \lambda e \otimes e) = \begin{cases} \theta(n - \lambda), & \lambda \leq 1, \\ \theta(n-1) + \vartheta(1-\lambda), & \lambda \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Thus, $H^{\pm}$ satisfy Conditions A, B and C.

4. Comparison principles

In this section we prove a version of the comparison principle that applies to the class of parabolic equations addressed in the work. If $k > 1$, f is non-constant, increasing and $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave (the equation is doubly nonlinear) then the comparison principle is proven under the condition that sub-solutions and super-solutions are positive. However, if $f \equiv 1$ and $k \geq 1$ then a comparison principle holds without any restrictions on the sign of the sub-solutions and super-solutions.

We state a comparison principle which is a slight variant of the version in [4] and our statement is influenced by the change of variables Lemma 2.3. We consider a more general operator than H. Let $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times S^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and satisfy

$$\text{(i) } F(t,r,p,X) \le F(t,r,p,Y),\ \forall (t,r,p) \in \Omega_T \times \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ and } \forall X,\ Y \in S^n \text{ with } X \le Y,$$

$$\text{(ii) } \forall (t,p,X) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times S^n,\ F(t,r_1,p,X) \le F(t,r_2,p,Y), \text{ if } r_1 \ge r_2. \tag{4.1}$$

In Lemma 4.1, the only condition imposed on F is (4.1).

Lemma 4.1. *(Comparison principle) Let F be as in (4.1), $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded non-increasing continuous function and $\hat{f} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be continuous. Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain and $T > 0$. Let $u \in usc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$ and $v \in lsc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$ satisfy in Ω_T,*

$$F(t,u,Du,D^2u + g(u)Du \otimes Du) - \hat{f}(t)u_t \ge 0 \ \text{ and } \ F(t,v,Dv,D^2v + g(v)Dv \otimes Dv) - \hat{f}(t)v_t \le 0.$$

If $\sup_{P_T} v < \infty$ and $u \le v$ on P_T then $u \le v$ in Ω_T.

Proof. We note that $X + g(u)p \otimes p \le Y + g(v)p \otimes p$, for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $X \le Y$ and $u \ge v$. The claim follows from [4]. □

Remark 4.2. (a) Let F, f, u and v be as in Lemma 4.1. Let $k = \sup_{P_T}(u - v)^+$ and $v_k = v + k$. Since $v_k \ge v$, by (4.1)(ii),

$$F(t,v_k,Dv_k,D^2v_k + g(v_k)Dv_k \otimes Dv_k) - f(t)(v_k)_t \le 0, \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u \le v_k, \text{ in } P_T.$$

By Remark 4.1, $u - v \le \sup_{P_T}(u - v)^+$.

(b) Suppose that $F = F(t,p,X)$ where $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $X \in S^n$, and $d \ge 0$ is a constant. Let $u \in usc(\Omega_T)$ and $v \in lsc(\Omega_T)$ solve

$$F(t,Du,D^2u + dDu \otimes Du) - u_t \ge 0, \ \text{ and } \ F(t,Dv,D^2v + dDv \otimes Dv) - v_t \ge 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T.$$

Then $u - v \le \sup_{P_T}(u - v)$. To see this, set $k = \sup_{P_T}(u - v)$ and take $v_k = v + k$. Lemma 4.1 shows that $u \le v_k$ in Ω_T and the claim holds. □

As an application of the above result we get a comparison principle for parabolic equations of the type

$$H(Du,D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T.$$

Recall (2.15), (2.16) and Lemma 2.3.

Theorem 4.3. *(Comparison principle) Let H satisfy Conditions A and B, see (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4). Suppose $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$, is a C^1 function and $\Gamma \ge 0$.*

Let $u \in usc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$ and $v \in lsc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$ satisfy

$$H(Du,D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t \ge 0, \ \text{ and } \ H(Dv,D^2v) + \chi(t)|Dv|^\Gamma - f(v)v_t \le 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T.$$

Case (i) $k > 1$, f is non-constant function, increasing and $\Gamma = k$. Assume that $f^{1/(k-1)}(\theta)$ is concave in θ.

Let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ to be an increasing C^2 function such that $\phi'(\tau) = f(\phi(\tau))^{1/(k-1)}$, see (2.15). If $u > 0$, $v > 0$, $\sup_{P_T} v < \infty$ and $u \le v$ on P_T then $\phi^{-1}(u) \le \phi^{-1}(v)$ and $u \le v$ in Ω_T. In general,

$$u \le \phi\left(\phi^{-1}(v) + \sup_{P_T}\{\phi^{-1}(u) - \phi^{-1}(v)\}^+\right).$$

Case (ii) $k \ge 1$, $f \equiv 1$ and any $\Gamma \ge 0$.

If $u \le v$, in P_T and $\sup_{P_T} v < \infty$ then $u \le v$ in Ω_T. More generally, $u - v \le \sup_{P_T}(u - v)$. The result holds regardless of the signs of u and v.

Proof. The claims follow from the change of variables Lemma 2.3, the comparison principle Lemma 4.1 and Remark 4.2. □

Remark 4.4. (a) The conclusion (i) of Theorem 4.3 holds for operators H that depend on t, u, Du, D^2u, H is decreasing in u and satisfy Conditions A and B. See Remark 4.2(a).

(b) Conclusion (ii) holds for the more general operator F as seen in Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 4.5. *(Maximum principle) (a) Let $k \ge 1$ and $f \equiv 1$. Assume that F satisfies (4.1) and $F(t, r, p, O) = 0$. Suppose that $u \in usc(lsc)(\Omega_T)$ solves*

$$F(t, u, Du, D^2u) - u_t \ge (\le)0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T.$$

Then $u \le \sup_{P_T} u$ ($u \ge \inf_{P_T} u$).

(b) Let $k > 1$, f a non-constant function and $\Gamma = k$. Suppose that F satisfies (4.1), Condition B (see (1.3)) and $F(t, r, p, O) = 0$. Assume that $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave. Suppose that $u \in usc(lsc)(\Omega_T)$, $u > 0$, solves

$$F(t, u, Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^k - f(u)u_t \ge (\le)0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T,$$

where χ is a continuous function. Then $u \le \sup_{P_T} u$ ($u \ge \inf_{P_T} u$).

Proof. Since $F(t, r, p, O) = 0$, for any (t, r, p), $t \ge 0$, the function $\phi = \sup_{P_T} u$ is a solution. Similarly, $\eta = \inf_{P_T} u$ is also a solution. Using Remark 2.5, Theorem 4.3 and Remark 4.4, the claims hold. □

Remark 4.6. Let F satisfy (4.1), Condition B and $F(t, r, p, O) = 0$. Suppose that $u \in usc(\Omega_T \cup P_T)$ solves

$$(*) \qquad F(t, u, Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^k - u^{k-1}u_t \ge (\le)0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T.$$

If $u > 0$ and $\phi = \log u$ then by Lemma 2.3,

$$F(t, e^{\phi}, D\phi, D^2\phi + D\phi \otimes D\phi) + \chi|D\phi|^k - \phi_t \ge (\le)0,$$

in Ω_T. Remark 4.2(a) shows that if $u > 0$ is a sub-solution of $(*)$ and $v > 0$ is super-solution of $(*)$ then

$$\frac{u}{v} \le \max\left(\sup_{P_T} \frac{u}{v},\ 1\right).$$

If $F = F(t, p, X)$ then Remark 4.2(b) shows that $u/v \leq \sup_{P_T}(u/v)$.

A quotient type comparison principle was derived for some doubly nonlinear parabolic equations in [1, 2]. □

Remark 4.7. Let H be as in Theorem 4.3, $k \geq 1$, and $f(u) = u^m,\ m \geq 0$. The condition $f^{1/(k-1)}(\theta),\ k > 1$, is concave in θ implies that $0 \leq m \leq k-1$ and Theorem 4.3 holds. For $k = 1$, we require that $m = 0$. For $m < 0$ or $m > k-1$, it is not clear to us if a comparison principle holds. □

5. Initial data $t = 0$. Constructions for Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

In Sections 5, 6 and 7, we address the existence of positive solutions to

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^{\Gamma} - f(u)u_t = 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u(x,t) = h(x,t),\ \forall (x,t) \in P_T, \tag{5.1}$$

where h is as in (2.4), $\Gamma > 0$ and $f : [c, \infty) \to [0, \infty),\ c \geq 0$, is C^1. Let us recall that

$$h(x,t) = \begin{cases} i(x), & \forall x \in \Omega, \text{ at } t = 0, \\ j(x,t), & \forall (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \end{cases}$$

where $i(x)$ and $j(x,t)$ are positive and continuous and, for any $y \in \partial\Omega$, $\lim_{x\to y} i(x) = \lim_{(z,t)\to(y,0)} j(z,t) = j(y,0)$, where $x \in \Omega$ and $z \in \partial\Omega$.

We will assume in Sections 5, 6 and 7 that

(i) Suppose that $k > 1$ and $f : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a non-constant function, $f^{1/(k-1)}(\theta)$ is concave in θ, f is increasing, and $\Gamma = k$, or

(ii) Suppose that $k \geq 1$ and $f \equiv 1$. Take $0 < \Gamma < \gamma$. (5.2)

This will ensure that the problem in (5.1) has a comparison principle. We also assume through out that

$$\text{Either (i) } \inf_{0\leq\theta<\infty} f(\theta) > 0, \text{ or (ii) } f \geq 0 \text{ and } f(\theta) = 0 \text{ iff } \theta = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Our proof of the existence of a positive continuous solution to the problem (5.1) involves constructing positive sub-solutions and super-solutions for the problem that are arbitrarily close, in a local sense, to the data specified on the parabolic boundary P_T. Existence then follows by using Perron's method [4]. Uniqueness is implied by Theorem 4.3. The ideas used are an adaptation of the works in [1, 2].

We divided our work into three sections. In this section we take up the construction for the initial data at $t = 0$. Our work in this section is valid for any bounded domain Ω.

Set $\vartheta = \inf_{P_T} h$ and $M = \sup_{P_T} h$. Assume that

$$0 < \vartheta \leq M < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \omega = \inf_{[\vartheta/2,\, 2M]} f(\theta) \leq \sup_{[\vartheta/2,\, 2M]} f(\theta) = \nu < \infty. \tag{5.4}$$

If $\vartheta = M$ then M is the solution. Through out the rest of the work, the quantity $\varepsilon > 0$ is small and so chosen that

$$0 < \frac{\vartheta}{2} < \vartheta - 2\varepsilon \leq M - 2\varepsilon \leq 2M. \tag{5.5}$$

Our constructions will ensure that the sub-solutions and the super-solutions η of (5.1) are bounded below by $\vartheta/2$ and bounded above by $2M$.

We start with the initial data $i(x)$. We select points $y \in \overline{\Omega}$ at $t = 0$. There are two cases to consider: (a) $y \in \Omega$, and (b) $y \in \partial\Omega$. We assume that $h(y, 0) > \vartheta$. If $h(y.0) = \vartheta$, we can take the sub-solution to be ϑ. Similarly, if $h(y, 0) = M$, we take the super-solution to be M.

We recall the following calculation. Let $g^{\pm}(x) = a \pm br^2,\ a,\ b \geq 0$, where $r = |x - z|$ for some $z \in I\!R^n$. By (1.3), (1.4) and Remark 2.2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \qquad (2b)^k\, r^{k_1} m(0) \leq H(Dg^+, D^2 g^+) \leq (2b)^k\, r^{k_1}\mu(0), \quad \text{and} \\ &(ii) \qquad -(2b)^k\, r^{k_1}\mu(0) \leq H(Dg^-, D^2 g^-) \leq -(2b)^k\, r^{k_1} m(0). \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Recall the definitions of $m(\lambda)$ and $\mu(\lambda)$, see (1.6) and (1.7). Thus, $\mu(0) \geq m(0) > 0$.

Part I's of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. Case (5.2)(i): $k > 1$, f non-constant, increasing, $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave and $\Gamma = k$.

Case (a): Let $y \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, small, so that (5.5) holds. By continuity, there is a $0 < \delta_0 \leq \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)$ such that

$$h(y, 0) - \varepsilon \leq h(x, 0) \leq h(y, 0) + \varepsilon, \ \ \forall x \in B_{\delta_0}(y).$$

Recall by the comment right after (5.6) that $\mu(0) > 0$. Set $r = |x - y|$.

Sub-solution: Note that $k_1 > 0$, see (1.3) and (1.4). Define

$$\tau = \frac{1}{\ell}\log\left(\frac{h(y, 0) - 2\varepsilon}{\vartheta - 2\varepsilon}\right), \quad b = \frac{1 - e^{-\ell\tau}}{\delta^2} \ \text{ and } \ \ell = \frac{3(8b)^k \delta^{k_1}\mu(0) M^{2k-1}}{\omega\vartheta^k} \tag{5.7}$$

where $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$. Note that $\ell = A\delta^{-k_1 - 2k_2}$, where A is independent of τ and δ. First we choose $\delta > 0$, small, and calculate ℓ, b and τ. In particular, choose δ small so that $\tau < T$.

Using (5.7), let R be the region

$$R = \{(x, t) : \ \ e^{\ell(\tau - t)}(1 - br^2) \geq 1, \ \ 0 \leq t \leq \tau.\} \tag{5.8}$$

The base of R is a spatial sphere of radius δ at $t = 0$, tapers as t increases and has an apex at (y, τ). We construct a bump like function at $(y, 0)$ which decreases in t.

Next, define

$$\eta(x, t) = \begin{cases} (\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(\tau - t)}(1 - br^2), & \forall (x, t) \in R, \\ \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, & \forall (x, t) \in (\Omega_T \cup P_T) \setminus R. \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

By (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9), $0 \le br^2 \le 1 - e^{\ell(t-\tau)},\ 0 \le t \le \tau$,

$$(i)\ \ \eta(y,0) = h(y,0) - 2\varepsilon, \quad (ii)\ \ \eta = \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } \partial R \cap \Omega_T, \quad (iii)\ \ \eta \le h, \text{ in } P_T,$$

$$\text{and } (iv)\ \ \frac{\vartheta}{2} \le \eta \le M. \tag{5.10}$$

Recalling (5.4), (5.6)(ii), (5.7), (5.9), setting $A = (\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(\tau-t)}$ and $B = \sup_{[0,T]} |\chi(t)|$ and estimating $B\delta^k \le 2\mu(0)\delta^{k_1}$ (take δ small), we calculate in $0 \le r \le \delta$ and $0 \le t \le \tau$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H(D\eta, D^2\eta) \ &+\ \chi(t)|D\eta|^k - f(\eta)\eta_t \ge A\ell f(\eta)(1-br^2) - A^k B(2br)^k - A^k(2b)^k r^{k_1}\mu(0) \\
&\ge\ A^k\left[\frac{\ell f(\eta)(1-b\delta^2)}{[(\vartheta-2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(\tau-t)}]^{k-1}} - (2b)^k\left(B\delta^k + \delta^{k_1}\mu(0)\right)\right] \\
&\ge\ A^k\left[\frac{\ell f(\eta)e^{-\ell\tau}}{[(\vartheta-2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(\tau-t)}]^{k-1}} - (2b)^k\left(B\delta^k + \delta^{k_1}\mu(0)\right)\right] \\
&=\ A^k\left(\frac{\ell\omega}{(\vartheta-2\varepsilon)^{k-1}e^{k\ell\tau}} - 3(2b)^k\delta^{k_1}\mu(0)\right) \\
&\ge\ A^k\left(\frac{\ell\omega}{M^{k-1}(4M/\vartheta)^k} - 3(2b)^k\delta^{k_1}\mu(0)\right) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

where we have used (5.5) and (5.7) (i.e, $1 - b\delta^2 = e^{-\ell\tau} \le 4M/\vartheta$). Thus, η is a sub-solution in R and Lemma 2.6 shows that η is a sub-solution in Ω_T.

Super-solution: The work is similar to what we did for the sub-solution. Define

$$\tau = \frac{1}{\ell}\log\left(\frac{M+2\varepsilon}{h(y,0)+2\varepsilon}\right), \quad b = \frac{e^{\ell\tau}-1}{\delta^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell = \frac{3(4b)^k\delta^{k_1}M^{k-1}\mu(0)}{\omega}, \tag{5.12}$$

where $0 < \delta \le \delta_0$. Again, $\gamma = O(\lambda^{-k_1-2k_2})$ implying that $\tau \to 0$ if $\delta \to 0$.

Let

$$R = \{(x,t) :\ \ (1+br^2)e^{\ell(t-\tau)} \le 1,\ \ 0 \le t \le \tau\}.$$

Then, $br^2 \le e^{\ell(\tau-t)} - 1$ and at $t = 0$, R is a ball of radius δ. As t increases R tapers to (y,τ). Define

$$\phi(x,t) = \begin{cases} (M+2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(t-\tau)}(1+br^2), & \forall (x,t) \in R, \\ M+2\varepsilon, & \forall (x,t) \in (\Omega_T \cup P_T)\setminus R. \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

It is clear that

$$(i)\ \ \phi(y,0) = h(y,0) + 2\varepsilon, \quad (ii)\ \ \phi = M + 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } \partial R \cap \Omega_T, \quad (iii)\ \ \phi \ge h, \text{ in } \in P_T,$$

$$\text{and } (iv)\ \ \vartheta \le \phi \le 2M. \tag{5.14}$$

Set $A = (M+2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(t-\tau)}$ and $B = \sup_{[0,T]}\chi(t)$. We calculate in R using (5.4), (5.7)(i), (5.12), (5.14) and the comment after (5.7), and see that, for small δ,

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\phi, D^2\phi) + \chi(t)|D\phi|^k &- f(\phi)\phi_t \le A^k(2b)^k r^{k_1}\mu(0) + A^k B(2br)^k - \ell\omega A(1+br^2) \\ &\le A^k\left[(2b)^k\left(\delta^{k_1}\mu(0) + B\delta^k\right) - \frac{\ell\omega}{[(M+2\varepsilon)e^{\gamma(t-\tau)}]^{k-1}}\right] \\ &\le A^k\left(3(2b)^k\delta^{k_1}\mu(0) - \frac{\ell\omega}{(2M)^{k-1}}\right) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Thus, ϕ is a super-solution in $R\cap\Omega_T$. Recalling (5.13) and using Lemma 2.6, ϕ is a super-solution in Ω_T.

Case (b) Let $y\in\partial\Omega$: By continuity, there are $\delta>0$ and $s>0$ such that

$$h(y,0)-\varepsilon \le h(x,t) \le h(y,0)+\varepsilon, \ \ \forall (x,t)\in\Omega_T\cap(B_\delta(y)\times[0,s]).$$

We utilize the quantities in (5.7) in our constructions. Take R as in Case (a) where ℓ in (5.7) large enough (take δ small) so that $\tau\le s$ and the apex $(y,\tau)\in B_\delta(y)\times[0,s]$.

Next, we define the sub-solution η as in (5.9) and ϕ as in (5.13). The rest of the work is similar to part (a). □

The Part II's of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 . Case (5.2)(ii): $k\ge 1$, $f\equiv 1$ **and any** $0<\Gamma<\gamma$**.**

We consider

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - u_t = 0, \ \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T. \tag{5.16}$$

For both the sub-solution and the super-solution we proceed as in Part I.

Let η be as in (5.9), and ϕ be as in (5.13). We discuss the changes needed in (5.7) and (5.12). Note that unlike Part I, $k_1=0$ may occur, i.e, $k=1$. We show that the calculations in the corresponding regions R continue to apply by modifying the quantity ℓ. The proof for the rest of Ω_T is as in Part I.

We address the sub-solution η. Let $(y,0)$ be as in Part I. Setting $A=(\vartheta-2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(\tau-t)}$ and $B=\sup_{[0,T]}|\chi(t)|$ in R (see (5.8) and (5.11)),

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\eta, D^2\eta) + \chi(t)|D\eta|^\Gamma - \eta_t &\ge A\ell(1-br^2) - A^\Gamma B(2br)^\Gamma - A^k(2b)^k r^{k_1}\mu(0) \\ &= A^k\left(\frac{\ell(1-br^2)}{A^{k-1}} - \left(A^{\Gamma-k}B(2br)^\Gamma + (2b)^k r^{k_1}\mu(0)\right)\right) \\ &\ge A^k\left(\frac{\ell(1-b\delta^2)}{A^{k-1}} - \left(A^{\Gamma-k}B(2b\delta)^\Gamma + (2b)^k\delta^{k_1}\mu(0)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\vartheta/2\le A\le 2M$, using the appropriate estimates for A(depending on whether $\Gamma\ge k$ or $\Gamma<k$) and choosing ℓ large, it follows that η is a sub-solution in R.

We now discuss the super-solution ϕ. Setting $A = (M + 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell(t-\tau)}$ and $B = \sup_{[0,T]} \chi(t)$ and calculating in R (see (5.15)),

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\phi, D^2\phi) + \chi(t)|D\phi|^k \quad &- \quad \phi_t = A^k(2b)^k r^{k_1}\mu(0) + A^\Gamma B(2br)^\Gamma - \ell A(1 + br^2) \\ &\leq \quad A^k \left((2b)^k \delta^{k_1}\mu(0) + A^{\Gamma-k} B(2b\delta)^\Gamma - \frac{\ell}{A^{k-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\vartheta/2 \leq A \leq 2M$, arguing as done above, one can choose ℓ large enough so that ϕ is a super-solution in R.

6. Side Boundary: Case (1.8) (i). Construction for Theorem 1.2.

We construct positive sub-solutions and super-solutions for the side boundary $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ when Case (i) in (1.8) holds. Our results hold for any bounded Ω.

As in Section 5, we assume that $f : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ and (5.3) holds. We present the work for Parts I and II of the theorem below.

We recall (5.1) for easy reference:

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_T, \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T. \tag{6.1}$$

Combining the set of sub-solutions and super-solutions in Section 5, the Perron method leads to existence of positive solutions of (6.1) when (1.8) (i) holds. Recall the notations and the conditions stated in (5.4) and (5.5).

We recall (1.8)(i): there is a

$$1 < \bar{\lambda} < 2 \quad \text{such that} \quad \mu(\bar{\lambda}) < 0, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\mu(\lambda) = \max\{m_{max}(\lambda), \ -\mu_{min}(\lambda)\}$, see (1.5) and (1.6).

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, small, and $(y, s) \in P_T$ where $s > 0$. By continuity, there is a $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 0$, depending on y and s, such that

$$h(y, s) - \varepsilon \leq h(x, t) \leq h(y, s) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \overline{D}_{\delta_0, 2\tau_0}(y, s) \cap P_T. \tag{6.3}$$

Recall from (1.3) and (1.4) that $k = k_1 + k_2$ and $\gamma = k_1 + 2k_2$. Set $r = |x - y|$. Let $v^\pm(r) = a \pm br^\beta$, where $b > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. From Remark 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \quad \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} m(2 - \beta) \leq H(Dv^+, D^2v^+) \leq \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} \mu(2 - \beta), \\ &(ii) \quad -\frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} \mu(2 - \beta) \leq H(Dv^-, D^2v^-) \leq -\frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} m(2 - \beta). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Also, the assumption in (6.2) shows that if $2 - \beta = \bar{\lambda}$ then $\beta = 2 - \bar{\lambda}$ and

$$\mu(2 - \beta) = \mu(\bar{\lambda}) < 0, \quad 0 < \beta < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma - \beta k > 0. \tag{6.5}$$

Recall that $\omega = \inf_{[\vartheta/2, 2M]} f(\theta)$ and $\nu = \sup_{[\vartheta/2, 2M]} f(\theta)$.

Part I: $k > 1$, f non-constant, increasing, $f^{1/(k-1)}$ concave and $\Gamma = k$.

Sub-solutions: Our idea is to construct a sub-solution η that will be defined in a region R that lies in $\overline{D}_{\delta_0,2\tau_0}(y,s)$ and then extended to the rest of Ω_T as a sub-solution. Moreover, $\vartheta/2 \le \eta \le M$. Choose

$$\ell\tau = \log\left(\frac{h(y,s)-2\varepsilon}{\vartheta-2\varepsilon}\right), \ \ \beta = 2-\bar{\lambda}, \quad B = \sup_{[0,T]}\chi(t), \quad 0 < \delta^{k_2} \le \min\left\{1,\ \delta_0^{k_2},\ \frac{|\mu(\bar{\lambda})|}{2B}\right\},$$

$$b\delta^{\beta} = 1 - e^{-\ell\tau}, \quad \text{and} \quad b \ge \left(\frac{2\ell\nu}{|\mu(\bar{\lambda})|\beta^k(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}}\right)^{1/k}. \tag{6.6}$$

Choose ℓ large so that $0 < \tau \le \tau_0$. Next, choose b large so that the lower bound holds and δ satisfies the conditions.

Set $r = |x-y|$. By (6.6), $1 - br^{\beta} > 0$, in $[0,\ \delta]$. Define, in $[0\ \delta] \times [s-\tau,\ s+\tau]$,

$$\text{the region } R \text{ to be the set: } \ \exp(\ell\tau - \ell|s-t|)(1-br^{\beta}) \ge 1, \quad |s-t| \le \tau, \tag{6.7}$$

In R, $br^{\beta} \le 1 - e^{\ell(|t-s|-\tau)}$ and thus, $\overline{R}$ lies in the cylinder $\overline{B}_{\delta}(y) \times [s-\tau, s+\tau]$. The set R is the spatial ball $B_{\delta}(y)$ (see (6.6)) and tapers to the points $(y, s\pm\tau)$ as $|s-t| \to \tau$.

In $\overline{\Omega}_T$, define the *bump function*

$$\eta(x,t) = \eta(r,t) = \begin{cases} (\vartheta-2\varepsilon)\exp(\ell\tau - \ell|s-t|)(1-br^{\beta}), & \forall (x,t) \in R, \\ \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, & \forall (x,t) \in \overline{\Omega}_T \setminus R. \end{cases} \tag{6.8}$$

From (6.3), (6.5), (6.6), (6.7) and (6.8) we see that

$$(i) \quad \max_{\Omega_T}\eta = \eta(y,s) = h(y,s) - 2\varepsilon, \ \ (ii)\ \eta \ge \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}_T, \ \ (iii)\ \eta = \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, \ \text{ in } \partial R \cap \Omega_T,$$

$$(iv) \quad \vartheta - 2\varepsilon \le \eta \le h(y,s) - 2\varepsilon \le h, \text{ in } R \cap P_T, \quad \text{and} \ \ (v)\ \eta \le h, \text{ in } P_T.$$

If we show that η is a sub-solution in $R \cap \Omega_T$ then by Lemma 2.6 η is a sub-solution in Ω_T. This together with the above listed observations (i)-(iv) would imply that η is a sub-solution of (6.1).

We consider the two cases: (a) $t \ne s$, and (b) $t = s$ in the interior of $R \cap \Omega_T$. Note that η is C^{∞} in x in $0 < r \le \delta$.

Case (a) $t \ne s$: Call $A = (\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell\tau - \ell|s-t|}$ and write $\eta = A(1-br^{\beta})$. Using (6.4), (6.5), (6.6), (6.8) and $\gamma - k\beta - k(1-\beta) = \gamma - k = k_2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\eta, D^2\eta) \ + \ \chi(t)|D\eta|^k - f(\eta)\eta_t &\ge \frac{-A^k(b\beta)^k\mu(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} - A^k B(b\beta r^{\beta-1})^k - \ell A f(\eta)(1-br^{\beta}) \\ &\ge A^k\left(\frac{(b\beta)^k|\mu(\bar{\lambda})|}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} - \frac{B(b\beta)^k}{r^{k(1-\beta)}} - \frac{\ell f(\eta)}{A^{k-1}}\right) = A^k\left[\frac{(\beta b)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}\left(|\mu(\bar{\lambda})| - Br^{k_2}\right) - \frac{\ell f(\eta)}{A^{k-1}}\right] \\ &\ge A^k\left(\frac{(b\beta)^k|\mu(\bar{\lambda})|}{2\delta^{\gamma-\beta k}} - \frac{\ell\nu}{(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}}\right) \ge 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

where we have used that $\vartheta/2 \le A \le M$. Hence, η is a sub-solution.

Case (b) $t = s$**:** Let ψ be a test function and $(z,s) \in R$ be such that $\eta - \psi$ has a maximum at (z,s). Then for $(x,t) \to (z,s)$,

(6.10)

$$\eta(x,t) \le \eta(z,s) + \psi_t(z,s)(t-s) + \langle D\psi(z,s), x-z\rangle + \frac{\langle D^2\psi(z,s)(x-z), x-z\rangle}{2} + o(|t-s| + |x-z|^2).$$

Since η is C^∞ in $r > 0$, using $t = s$ in (6.10) we get $D\psi(z,s) = D\eta(z,s)$ and $D^2\psi(z,s) \ge D^2\eta(z,s)$. Using (6.8),taking $x = z$ in (6.10) and $r = |z-y|$.

$$\psi_t(z,s)(t-s) + o(|t-s|) \ge (\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)(1 - br^\beta)\left[\exp(\ell\tau - \ell|t-s|) - \exp(\ell\tau)\right], \quad \text{as } t \to s.$$

Hence,

$$|\psi_t(z,s)| \le \ell(\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell\tau}(1 - br^\beta).$$

Using the observations made above and arguing as in Case (a) (see (6.9)), we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\psi, D^2\psi)(z,s) &+ \chi(s)|D\psi(z,s)|^k - f(\eta)(z,s)\psi_t(z,s) \\ &\ge H(D\eta, D^2\eta)(z,s) + \chi(s)|D\eta(z,s)|^k - f(\eta)(z,s)(\psi_t)(z,s) \\ &\ge H(D\eta, D^2\eta) + \chi(s)|D\eta(z,s)|^k - f(\eta)\ell(\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell\tau}(1 - br^\beta) \ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus η is a sub-solution in $R \cap \Omega_T$.

Super-solutions: In this part, we construct a super-solution η of (6.1). Our work is quite similar to the work for the sub-solution. Choose

$$\ell\tau = \log\left(\frac{M+2\varepsilon}{h(y,s)+2\varepsilon}\right), \ \ \beta = 2 - \bar\lambda, \quad B = \sup_{[0,T]}\chi(t), \quad 0 < \delta^{k_2} \le \min\left\{1,\ \delta_0^{k_2},\ \frac{|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2B}\right\},$$

$$b\delta^\beta = e^{\ell\tau} - 1, \ \text{ and } \ b \ge \left(\frac{8M\ell\nu}{(\vartheta\beta)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}\right)^{1/k}. \tag{6.11}$$

We choose $\ell > 0$ so that $0 < \tau \le \tau_0$ and δ small by choosing b large.

The region R is defined as follows.

$$R \text{ is the set: } (1 + br^\beta)\exp(\ell|t-s| - \ell\tau) \le 1, \ \ |s-t| \le \tau.$$

Clearly, $br^\beta \le e^{\ell(\tau - |s-t|)} - 1$, and thus, $\overline{R} \subset \overline{B}_\delta(y) \times [s-\tau, s+\tau]$.

Define the *indent function* in Ω_T as follows:

$$\phi(x,t) = \begin{cases} (M+2\varepsilon)(1+br^\beta)\exp(\ell|s-t| - \ell\tau), & \forall (x,t) \in R, \\ M + 2\varepsilon, & \forall (x,t) \in \overline{\Omega}_T \setminus R. \end{cases} \tag{6.12}$$

Using (6.11) and (6.12),

$$(i) \quad \min_{\Omega_T}\phi = \phi(y,s) = h(y,s) + 2\varepsilon, \ \ (ii)\ \phi \le M + 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}_T, \ \ (iii)\ \phi = M + 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } \partial R \cap \Omega_T,$$

$$(iv) \quad h \le h(y,s) + 2\varepsilon \le \phi \le M + 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } R \cap P_T, \quad \text{and } (iv)\ \ \phi \ge h, \text{ in } P_T.$$

We show that ϕ is a super-solution in $R \cap \Omega_T$. Lemma 2.6 and the observations (i)-(v), listed above, would then imply that ϕ is a super-solution of (6.1). We consider the cases: (a) $t \ne s$, and (b) $t = s$.

(a) $t \neq s$**:** Noting that $\eta \in C^\infty$, setting $A = (M + 2\varepsilon)\exp(\ell|s-t| - \ell\tau)$ and applying (6.4)(i) in $0 < r \leq \delta$, (6.5), (6.8) and (6.11),

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\phi, D^2\phi) \;+\; \chi(t)|D\phi|^k - f(\phi)\phi_t &\leq \frac{A^k\,(b\beta)^k\,\mu(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} + A^k B(\beta b)^k r^{(\beta-1)k} + \nu A\ell(1+br^\beta) \\ &\leq A^k\left(\frac{\ell\nu(1+b\delta^\beta)}{A^{k-1}} + B(\beta b)^k r^{(\beta-1)k} - \frac{(b\beta)^k\,|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}\right) \\ &= A^k\left[\frac{\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}} + \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-k\beta}}\left(Br^{k_2} - |\mu(\bar\lambda)|\right)\right] \leq A^k\left(\frac{4M\ell\nu}{\vartheta^k} - \frac{(b\beta)^k\,|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2\delta^{\gamma-\beta k}}\right) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

where we have used that $e^{\ell\tau} \leq 4M/\vartheta$ and $A \geq \vartheta$. Thus ϕ is a super-solution.

(b) $t = s$**:** Let ψ be a test function and $(z,s) \in R \cap \Omega_T$ be such that $\phi - \psi$ has a maximum at (z,s). Then, as $(x,t) \to (z,s)$,

(6.14)

$$\phi(x,t) - \phi(z,s) \geq \psi_t(z,s)(t-s) + \langle D\psi(z,s), x-z\rangle + \frac{\langle D^2\psi(z,s)(x-z), x-z\rangle}{2} + o(|t-s| + |x-y|^2).$$

We take $x = z$ in (6.14), set $r = |z-y|$ and use (6.12) to see that

$$\psi_t(z,s)(t-s) + o(|t-s|) \leq (M+2\varepsilon)(1+br^\beta)[\exp(\ell|t-s| - \ell\tau) - \exp(-\ell\tau)] \;\text{ as }\; t \to s.$$

Thus,

$$|\psi_t(z,s)| \leq \ell(M+2\varepsilon)(1+br^\beta)e^{-\ell\tau}.$$

Since η is C^2 in $r > 0$, (6.14) shows that $D\psi(z,s) = D\eta(z,s)$ and $D^2\psi(z,s) \leq D^2\eta(z,s)$. Using (6.1) and arguing as in (a),

$$\begin{aligned} &H(D\psi, D^2\psi)(z,s) + \chi(s)|D\psi(z,s)|^k - f(\phi)\psi_t(z,s) \\ &\quad \leq H(D\eta, D^2\eta)(z,s) + \chi(s)|\eta(z,s)|^k + \ell f(\phi)(z,s)(M+2\varepsilon)(1+br^\beta)e^{-\ell|s-t|\ell\tau} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, ϕ is a super-solution in the interior of $R \cap \Omega_T$.

Part II: $k \geq 1$**,** $f \equiv 1$ **and any** $0 < \Gamma < \gamma$**.**

As done in Section 5, we provide an outline of the constructions. The value of b in the functions η and ϕ (see (6.8) and (6.12)) will undergo a slight change. The differential equation reads

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - u_t = 0, \;\text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T.$$

Set $a = \gamma - k\beta - \Gamma(1-\beta)$, where β is as in (6.5). Then

$$a - \beta(\Gamma - k) = \gamma - k\beta - \Gamma(1-\beta) - \beta(\Gamma - k) = \gamma - \Gamma. \tag{6.15}$$

We show Case (a) for both η and ϕ in Part I. Case (b) is quite similar to what was done in Part I.

We start with η and use (6.6), (6.9) and (6.15), to get

$$H(D\eta, D^2\eta) + \chi(t)|D\eta|^\Gamma - f(\eta)\eta_t \geq \frac{-A^k(b\beta)^k\mu(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} - B(Ab\beta r^{\beta-1})^\Gamma - \ell A f(\eta)(1-br^\beta)$$
$$\geq A^k\left(\frac{(b\beta)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} - \frac{BA^{\Gamma-k}(b\beta)^\Gamma}{r^{\Gamma(1-\beta)}} - \frac{\ell f(\eta)}{A^{k-1}}\right) = A^k\left[\frac{(\beta b)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}\left(|\mu(\bar\lambda)| - (Ab\beta)^{\Gamma-k}Br^a\right) - \frac{\ell f(\eta)}{A^{k-1}}\right]$$
$$\geq A^k\left[\frac{(\beta b)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}\left(|\mu(\bar\lambda)| - \frac{(A\beta)^{\Gamma-k}B\delta^a}{\delta^{\beta(\Gamma-k)}}\right) - \frac{\ell f(\eta)}{A^{k-1}}\right] \geq A^k\left(\frac{(b\beta)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2\delta^{\gamma-\beta k}} - \frac{\ell\nu}{(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}}\right) \geq 0,$$

where (in the second term above) we have used that $b \leq \delta^{-\beta}$, $\delta^{a-\beta(\Gamma-k)} = \delta^{\gamma-\Gamma}$, δ is small and b is large enough. This verifies that η is a sub-solution.

Next, we use (6.11), (6.12), (6.15), (6.13), $e^{\ell\tau} \leq 2M/\vartheta$ and see that

$$H(D\phi, D^2\phi) + \chi(t)|D\phi|^\Gamma - f(\phi)\phi_t \leq \frac{A^k\left(b\beta\right)^k\mu(2-\beta)}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} + B(A\beta b)^\Gamma r^{(\beta-1)\Gamma} + \nu A\ell(1+br^\beta)$$
$$\leq A^k\left(\frac{\ell\nu(1+b\delta^\beta)}{A^{k-1}} + BA^{\Gamma-k}(\beta b)^\Gamma r^{(\beta-1)\Gamma} - \frac{\left(b\beta\right)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}\right)$$
$$\leq A^k\left[\frac{\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}} + \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-k\beta}}\left(B(Ab\beta)^{\Gamma-k}r^a - |\mu(\bar\lambda)|\right)\right]$$
$$\leq A^k\left[\frac{\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}} + \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-k\beta}}\left(\left(\frac{2MA\beta}{\vartheta}\right)^{\Gamma-k}\frac{B\delta^a}{\delta^{\beta(\Gamma-k)}} - |\mu(\bar\lambda)|\right)\right] \leq A^k\left(\frac{4M\ell\nu}{\vartheta^k} - \frac{\left(b\beta\right)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2\delta^{\gamma-\beta k}}\right) \leq 0,$$

by using in the third line $b = (e^{\ell\tau}-1)\delta^{-\beta} \leq (2M/\vartheta)\delta^{-\beta}$, taking δ small enough and then b large enough.

Remark 6.1. The discussion done above shows the existence of positive solutions of

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - u_t = 0, \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T,$$

where $h > 0$. For a general h, define $\hat h = h + 2\vartheta$. Then $\hat h > 0$ and the above has a positive solution $\hat u$. Thus, $u = \hat u - 2\vartheta$ solves the required differential equation. □.

7. Side Boundary: The case (1.8) (ii). Construction for Theorem 1.3.

In this section we assume that (1.8)(ii) holds, that is,

$$\text{there is a } \bar\lambda \geq 2 \text{ such that } \mu(\lambda) < 0,\ \forall\lambda > \bar\lambda. \tag{7.1}$$

Also, recall (1.5), (1.6) and (1.7). In addition, we impose that Ω satisfy a uniform outer ball condition. More precisely: there is a $\rho_0 > 0$ such that, for each $y \in \partial\Omega$, if $0 < \rho \leq \rho_0$ then there is a $z \in I\!R^n \setminus \Omega$ such that ball $B_\rho(z) \subset I\!R^n \setminus \Omega$ and $y \in \partial B_\rho(z) \cap \partial\Omega$.

Our goal is to construct sub-solutions η and super-solutions ϕ of

$$H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = 0, \text{ in } \Omega_T \text{ and } u = h, \text{ in } P_T. \tag{7.2}$$

Let $(y,s) \in P_T$ where $s > 0$. There is a $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 0$, small, depending on y and s, such that

$$h(y,s) - \varepsilon \le h(x,t) \le h(y,s) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall (x,t) \in \overline{D}_{\delta_0, 2\tau_0}(y,s) \cap P_T. \tag{7.3}$$

Recall that $\vartheta = \inf_{P_T} h$, $M = \sup_{P_T} h$, and assume that $0 < \vartheta \le M < \infty$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, small, such that $\vartheta - 2\varepsilon > 0$.

As done in Section 6, we recall Remark 2.2: let $b > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $v^{\pm}(r) = a \pm br^{-\beta}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \quad -\frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}}\mu(\beta+2) \le H(Dv^+, D^2v^+) \le -\frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}} m(\beta+2), \\ &(ii) \quad \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}} m(\beta+2) \le H(Dv^-, D^2v^-) \le \frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}\mu(\beta+2). \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

Set $\beta + 2 > \bar{\lambda}$ then $\beta > \bar{\lambda} - 2$ and

$$\mu(\beta+2) \le \mu(\bar{\lambda}) < 0, \quad \beta > 0 \ \text{ and } \ \beta k + \gamma > 0. \tag{7.5}$$

Recall that $\omega = \inf_{[\vartheta/2,\, 2M]} f(\theta)$ and $\nu = \sup_{[\vartheta/2,\, 2M]} f(\theta)$.

Part I: $k > 1$, f non-constant, increasing, $f^{1/(k-1)}$ is concave and $\Gamma = k$.

Sub-solutions: By our hypothesis, let $z \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ and $0 < \rho$ be such that $B_\rho(z) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ and $y \in \partial B_\rho(z) \cap \partial\Omega$. Set $r = |x - z|$; the region R will be in the cylindrical shell $(\overline{B}_{2\rho}(z) \setminus B_\rho(z)) \times [s - \tau, s + \tau]$, where ρ and τ will be determined below. We require that this shell be in $D_{\delta_0, 2\tau_0}(y,s)$ and this is achieved if $4\rho \le \delta_0$.

Set $C = \sup_{[0,T]} |\chi(t)|$ and choose

$$\ell\tau = \log\left(\frac{h(y,s) - 2\varepsilon}{\vartheta - 2\varepsilon}\right), \ \ \beta > \bar{\lambda} - 2 \ \text{ and } \ 0 < \rho \le \min\left\{\frac{\delta_0}{4}, \ \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{|\mu(\bar{\lambda})|}{2C}\right)^{1/(\gamma-k)}\right\}. \tag{7.6}$$

We choose ℓ, large, so that $0 < \tau \le \tau_0$. A value of ρ will be chosen later.

We define the region R as follows: for $\rho \le r \le 2\rho$ and $|s - t| \le \tau$, let

$$R \text{ is the region: } \ \exp(\ell\tau - \ell|s-t|)\left[1 - \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\ell\tau}}{1 - 2^{-\beta}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\rho^\beta}{r^\beta}\right)\right] \ge 1. \tag{7.7}$$

At $t = s$, the region R is the spatial annulus $\rho \le r \le 2\rho$, tapers as $|t - s| \to \tau$ and at $|s - t| = \tau$ we get $r = \rho$. Also, $\overline{R} \subset (\overline{B}_{2\rho}(z) \setminus B_\rho(z)) \times [s - \tau, s + \tau]$.

Define the following *bump function* in Ω_T:

$$\eta(x,t) = \eta(r,t) = \begin{cases} (\vartheta - 2\varepsilon)\exp(\ell\tau - \ell|s-t|)\left[1 - \left(\frac{1-e^{-\ell\tau}}{1-2^{-\beta}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\rho^\beta}{r^\beta}\right)\right], & \text{in } R, \\ \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, & \text{in } \overline{\Omega}_T \setminus R. \end{cases} \tag{7.8}$$

Using (7.3), (7.6), (7.7) and (7.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \ \ \eta(y,s) = h(y,s) - 2\varepsilon, \quad (ii) \ \ \eta \ge \vartheta - 2\varepsilon, \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}_T, \quad (iii) \ \ \eta \le h, \text{ in } P_T, \\ &\text{and } \ (iv) \ \vartheta - 2\varepsilon \le \eta \le h(y,s) - 2\varepsilon \le h \le M, \ \text{ in } R \cap P_T. \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

Clearly, if η is a sub-solution in Ω_T, the observations (7.9) (i)-(iv), listed above, would then imply that η is a sub-solution of (7.2). We first show that η is a sub-solution in $R\cap\Omega_T$. We consider: (a) $t\neq s$, and (b) $t=s$. Lemma 2.6 then shows η is a sub-solution in Ω_T.

(a) $t\neq s$**:** Set $A=(\vartheta-2\varepsilon)e^{\ell\tau-\ell|s-t|}$ and $B=(1-e^{-\ell\tau})(1-2^{-\beta})^{-1}$. Note η is C^∞ (in x) in $R\cap\Omega_T$. Using (7.4)(i), (7.5), (7.8) and bounding the spatial part of η from above by 1, we get in $\rho\le r\le 2\rho$, $0<|s-t|\le\tau$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H(D\eta,D^2\eta) &+ \chi(t)|D\eta|^k-f(\eta)\eta_t\ge\frac{(AB)^k(\beta\rho^\beta)^k|\mu(2+\beta)|}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}-\frac{C(AB\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k(1+\beta)}}-\nu\ell A\\
&\ge (AB)^k\left(\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}-\frac{C(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k(1+\beta)}}-\frac{\nu\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k}\right)\\
&= (AB)^k\left[\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}}\left(|\mu(\bar\lambda)|-Cr^{\gamma-k}\right)-\frac{\nu\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k}\right]\\
&\ge (AB)^k\left[\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{(2\rho)^{k\beta+\gamma}}\frac{|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2}-\frac{\nu\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k}\right]\ge(AB)^k\left(\frac{\beta^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2^{\beta k+\gamma+1}\rho^\gamma}-\frac{2^{k-1}\nu\ell}{B^k\vartheta^{k-1}}\right)\ge 0,
\end{aligned}\tag{7.10}$$

where $A\ge\vartheta/2$ and ρ is chosen small enough. Thus, η is sub-solution in $R\cap\Omega_T$.

Part (b) and the rest of the proof is similar to that in Part I of Section 6.

Super-solutions: We now construct a super-solution $\phi>0$ to (7.2). The ideas are similar to those in Part I and we make use of (7.4)(i). The ball $B_\rho(z)$ is the outer ball at $y\in\partial\Omega$, see the discussion for sub-solutions.

Set

$$\beta=\bar\lambda-2,\ \ \ell\tau=\log\left(\frac{M+2\varepsilon}{h(y,s)+2\varepsilon}\right),\ \text{ and }\ \ 0<\rho\le\delta_0/4.\tag{7.11}$$

Select ℓ, large, so that $0<\tau\le\tau_0$. A more precise (and smaller) value of ρ is chosen later.

Define $r=|x-z|$. Let R be the region in $\rho\le r\le 2\rho$, $|s-t|\le\tau$, defined as follows.

$$R\text{ is the region: }\ \exp(\ell|s-t|-\ell\tau)\left[1+\left(\frac{e^{\ell\tau}-1}{1-2^{-\beta}}\right)\left(1-\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\beta\right)\right]\le 1.\tag{7.12}$$

Note that if $t=s$ then the spatial annulus $\rho\le r\le 2\rho$ is in R. The region tapers as $|s-t|\to\tau$ and at $|s-t|=\tau$ we have $r=\rho$.

In $\overline{\Omega}_T$, define the *indent function*

(7.13)

$$\phi(x,t)=\begin{cases}(M+2\varepsilon)\exp(\ell|s-t|-\ell\tau)\left[1+\left(\frac{e^{\ell\tau}-1}{1-2^{-\beta}}\right)\left(1-\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^\beta\right)\right], & \forall(x,t)\in R\\ M+2\varepsilon, & \forall(x,t)\in\overline{\Omega}_T\setminus R.\end{cases}$$

Using (7.3), (7.11) and (7.12) we see that

$$(i)\ \phi(y,s)=h(y,s)+2\varepsilon,\quad (ii)\ \phi\le M+2\varepsilon,\ \text{in }\overline{\Omega}_T,\quad (iii)\ \ \phi\ge h,\ \text{in }P_T,$$
$$(iv)\ h\le h(y,s)+2\varepsilon\le\phi\le 2M,\ \ \text{in } R\cap P_T.$$

We now show that η is a super-solution in $R \cap \Omega_T$. We consider: (a) $t \neq s$, and (b) $t = s$. Lemma 2.6 will then show that η is a super-solution in Ω_T.

(a) $t \neq s$**:** Set $A = (M + 2\varepsilon)e^{\ell|s-t|-\ell\tau}$, $B = (e^{\ell\tau} - 1)(1 - 2^{-\beta})^{-1}$ and $C = \sup_{[0,T]} |\chi(t)|$. Using (7.4)(ii), (7.13) and bounding the spatial part of ϕ by $2e^{\ell\tau}$, we get in $\rho \leq r \leq 2\rho$, $0 < |t - s| \leq \tau$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(D\phi, D^2\phi) + \chi(t)|D\phi|^k - f(\phi)\phi_t &\leq \frac{(AB)^k \left(\beta\rho^\beta\right)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}\mu(\beta+2) + \frac{(AB)^k C(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k(1+\beta)}} + 2\nu\ell A e^{\ell\tau} \\
&\leq (AB)^k \left(\frac{2\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}B^k} + \frac{C(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k(1+\beta)}} - \frac{\left(\beta\rho^\beta\right)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}|\mu(\bar\lambda)| \right) \qquad (7.14) \\
&= (AB)^k \left[\frac{2\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}B^k} + \frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}}(Cr^{\gamma-k} - |\mu(\bar\lambda)|) \right] \leq (AB)^k \left(\frac{2\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}B^k} - \frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}}\frac{|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2} \right) \\
&\leq (AB)^k \left(\frac{2\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{B^k(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}} - \frac{C\left(\beta\rho^\beta\right)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2(2\rho)^{\beta k+\gamma}} \right) = (AB)^k \left(\frac{2\nu\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{B^k(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}} - \frac{C|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2^{\beta k+\gamma+1}\rho^\gamma} \right) \leq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used $A \geq \vartheta/2$ and ρ is small. We see that ϕ is a super-solution.

The proof of Part (b) and the rest of the proof is similar to that in Part I.

Part II: $k \geq 1$**,** $f \equiv 1$ **and any** $0 < \Gamma < \gamma$**.**

Our discussion is similar to Part II in Section 6. We will verify that η and ϕ as in (7.8) and (7.13), with slight modification, continue to be sub-solutions and super-solutions. The differential equation reads

$$
H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - u_t = 0, \text{ in } \Omega_T, \text{ and } u = h \text{ in } P_T.
$$

We compute with η, see (7.8) and (7.10). The definitions of A, B and C continue to be the same.

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(D\eta, D^2\eta) \;+\; \chi(t)|D\eta|^\Gamma - \eta_t &\geq \frac{(AB)^k(\beta\rho^\beta)^k|\mu(2+\beta)|}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}} - \frac{C(AB\beta\rho^\beta)^\Gamma}{r^{\Gamma(1+\beta)}} - \ell A \\
&\geq (AB)^k \left(\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}} - \frac{C(AB)^{\Gamma-k}(\beta\rho^\beta)^\Gamma}{r^{\Gamma(1+\beta)}} - \frac{\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k} \right) \\
&= (AB)^k \left[\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}} \left(|\mu(\bar\lambda)| - \frac{C(AB\beta)^{\Gamma-k}\rho^{\beta(\Gamma-k)}}{r^{\beta(\Gamma-k)+\Gamma-\gamma}} \right) - \frac{\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k} \right] \\
&= (AB)^k \left[\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}} \left(|\mu(\bar\lambda)| - C(AB\beta)^{\Gamma-k} r^{\gamma-\Gamma} \left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\beta(\Gamma-k)} \right) - \frac{\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k} \right] \\
&\geq (AB)^k \left[\frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{(2\rho)^{k\beta+\gamma}}\frac{|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2} - \frac{\ell}{A^{k-1}B^k} \right] \geq (AB)^k \left(\frac{\beta^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2^{\beta k+\gamma+1}\rho^\gamma} - \frac{2^{k-1}\ell}{B^k\vartheta^{k-1}} \right) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used $\Gamma < \gamma$, $\rho \leq r \leq 2\rho$ and ρ is chosen small. The rest is as in Part I.

Next, we calculate using ϕ, see (7.13) and (7.14). The definitions of $A,\ B$ and C continue to be the same. In what follows $\rho \le r \le 2\rho$ and ρ is small.

$$\begin{aligned} H(D\phi, D^2\phi) \quad + \quad & \chi(t)|D\phi|^\Gamma - \phi_t \le \frac{(AB)^k \left(\beta\rho^\beta\right)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}\mu(\beta+2) + \frac{C(AB\beta\rho^\beta)^\Gamma}{r^{\Gamma(1+\beta)}} + 2\ell A e^{\ell\tau} \\ \le \quad & (AB)^k\left(\frac{2\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}B^k} + \frac{C(AB)^{\Gamma-k}(\beta\rho^\beta)^\Gamma}{r^{k(1+\beta)}} - \frac{\left(\beta\rho^\beta\right)^k}{r^{\beta k+\gamma}}|\mu(\bar\lambda)|\right) \\ = \quad & (AB)^k\left[\frac{2\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}B^k} + \frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}}\left(C(AB\beta)^{\Gamma-k}r^{\gamma-\Gamma}\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^{\beta(\Gamma-k)} - |\mu(\bar\lambda)|\right)\right] \\ \le \quad & (AB)^k\left(\frac{2\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{A^{k-1}B^k} - \frac{(\beta\rho^\beta)^k}{r^{k\beta+\gamma}}\frac{|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2}\right) \le (AB)^k\left(\frac{2\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{B^k(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}} - \frac{C\left(\beta\rho^\beta\right)^k|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2(2\rho)^{\beta k+\gamma}}\right) \\ = \quad & (AB)^k\left(\frac{2\ell e^{\ell\tau}}{B^k(\vartheta/2)^{k-1}} - \frac{C|\mu(\bar\lambda)|}{2^{\beta k+\gamma+1}\rho^\gamma}\right) \le 0. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is as in Part I. Now apply Remark 6.1 to get the general statement.

8. Appendix

We also discuss a maximum principle that applies to the case where f is a positive continuous function. No sign conditions are imposed on the sub-solutions and super-solutions.

Recall Conditions A and B, (1.2)-(1.6). From (1.5), we have

$$m_{\min}(\lambda) = \inf_{|e|=1} H(e, I-\lambda e\otimes e),\ \ \mu_{\max} = \sup_{|e|=1} H(e, \lambda e\otimes e - I)$$

and $m(\lambda) = \min(m_{\min}(\lambda),\ -\mu_{\max}(\lambda))$. In place of Condition C, we assume that

$$m(0) > 0 \ \text{ and } \ \lim_{\lambda\to-\infty} m(\lambda) = \infty. \tag{8.1}$$

Recall the notation, $\hat H(p,X) = -H(p,-X),\ \forall (p,X)\in \mathbb{R}^n\times S^n$, see Remark 1.9.

Lemma 8.1. *(Weak Maximum Principle) Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n,\ n\ge 2$, be a bounded domain and $T>0$. Suppose that H satisfies Conditions A, B and (7.1). Suppose that $\chi:[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ and $f:\mathbb{R}\to[0,\infty)$ and $f\not\equiv 0$, are continuous functions.*

Let $\Gamma>0$ and $\phi\in usc(lsc)(\Omega_T\cup P_T)$ ($\phi\in lsc(\Omega_T\cup P_T)$) solve

$$H(D\phi, D^2\phi) + \chi(t)|D\phi|^\Gamma - f(\phi)\phi_t \ge (\le) 0, \ \ \text{in } \Omega_T.$$

(a) If $\Gamma\ge k$ then $\sup_{\Omega_T}\phi \le \sup_{P_T}\phi = \sup_{\Omega_T\cup P_T}\phi$ ($\inf_{\Omega_T}\phi \ge \inf_{P_T}\phi = \inf_{\Omega_T\cup P_T}\phi$).
(b) If $0<\Gamma<k$ and $\inf f>0$ then the conclusion in (a) holds.
(c) If $\chi\equiv 0$ then the conclusion in (a) holds even if $\inf f = 0$.

Proof. Let $0<\hat\tau<\tau<T$, $\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau} = \Omega\times[\hat\tau,\ \tau]$ and P the parabolic boundary of $\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}$. Our goal is to prove the weak maximum principle in $\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}$ for any $0<\hat\tau<\tau<T$ and then extend it to Ω_T. Note that u is bounded from above in $\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}$ since $u\in usc(\Omega_T\cup P_T)$.

Choose $z\in\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\Omega$ and $R>0$ such that $\Omega\subset B_R(z)\setminus B_{R/2}(z)$. Call $r=|x-z|$; clearly, $R/2\le r\le R,\ \forall x\in\Omega$.

Set

$$\vartheta = \sup_{\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}} \phi, \quad \ell = \sup_{P} \phi, \quad \delta = \vartheta - \ell, \quad c = \sup_{\overline\Omega} \phi(x,\tau), \quad \eta = \max(\delta, \ \ c-\ell)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \nu = \max(c, \ \vartheta, \ \ell). \tag{8.2}$$

We recall from Remark 2.2 and (6.4)(ii) that if $v = a - br^\beta$, where $b > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, then

$$-\frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}}\mu(2-\beta) \le H(Dv, D^2v) \le -\frac{(b\beta)^k}{r^{\gamma-\beta k}} m(2-\beta). \tag{8.3}$$

We argue by contradiction and assume that $\delta > 0$. Since Ω_τ is an open set there is a point $(\xi,\theta) \in \Omega_\tau$ such that $\phi(\xi,\theta) > \ell + 3\delta/4$ and $0 < \hat\tau < \theta < \tau$. Define

$$g(t) = 0, \ \ \forall t \in [\hat\tau, \ \theta] \quad \text{and} \quad g(t) = (t-\theta)^4/(\tau-\theta)^4, \ \ \forall t \in [\theta, \ \tau].$$

Select $0 < \varepsilon \le \min(0.5, \ \delta/4)$. For $\beta > 0$, set

$$\psi(x,t) = \psi(r,t) = \ell + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \eta g(t) - \frac{\varepsilon r^\beta}{32R^\beta}, \ \ \forall (x,t) \in \overline\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}.$$

Thus, $\psi(x,t) \ge \ell + \varepsilon/8, \ \forall (x,t) \in \overline\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}$, and $\psi(x,\tau) \ge \ell + \eta + \varepsilon/8 \ge c + \varepsilon/8, \ \forall x \in \overline\Omega$. Moreover,

$$\phi(\xi,\theta) - \psi(\xi,\theta) \ge \ell + \frac{3\delta}{4} - \ell - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} = \frac{3\delta}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \ge \frac{\delta}{4} > 0. \tag{8.4}$$

Since $\phi - \psi \le 0$ on $\partial\overline\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}$ and $(\phi-\psi)(\xi,\theta) > 0$, the function $\phi - \psi$ has a positive maximum at some point $(y,s) \in \Omega_\tau$.

Set $A = \sup_{[0,T]} |\chi(t)|$, call $\rho = |y-z|$ and use (8.3) to get

$$\begin{aligned} H\left(D\psi(y,s), D^2\psi(y,s)\right) \ &+ \ \chi(s)|D\psi(y,s)|^\Gamma \le -\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^k \frac{m(2-\beta)}{\rho^{\gamma-\beta k}} + A\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^\Gamma \rho^{(\beta-1)\Gamma} \\ &= \ \rho^{\beta k-\gamma}\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^k \left[A\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^{\Gamma-k} \rho^{\nu-\Gamma+\beta(\Gamma-k)} - m(2-\beta)\right] \\ &= \ \rho^{\beta k-\gamma}\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^k \left[A\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32}\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^\beta\right)^{\Gamma-k} \rho^{\nu-\Gamma} - m(2-\beta)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

Call I the right hand side of the third line in (8.5) and note that $1/2 \le \rho/R \le 1$. We now show part (a) of the lemma.

(i) If $\Gamma > k$ then taking $\beta = 2$ and ε small enough we can make $I < 0$. We conclude from (8.5) that $I < 0 \le f(\phi(y,s))\psi_t(y,s)$ implying that the lemma holds for $0 < \hat\tau < \tau < T$

(ii) If $\Gamma = k$ then $\gamma - k = k_2$ (see (1.3) and (1.4)). Taking β large and using (8.1) we can make $I < 0$. We conclude from (8.5) that $I < 0 \le f(\phi(y,s))\psi_t(y,s)$ implying that the lemma holds for $0 < \hat\tau < \tau < T$.

Taking $A = 0$ and arguing as above we get part (c) of the lemma.

To see part (b), set $m = \inf f$ and modify $g(t) = (t/\tau)^\alpha$, where α is large so that $\eta g(\theta) \le \varepsilon/8$. Since $\varepsilon \le \delta/4$, this ensures that in (8.4)

$$\phi(\xi,\theta) - \psi(\xi,\theta) \ge \ell + \frac{3\delta}{4} - (\ell + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \eta g(\theta)) \ge \frac{3\delta}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \ge \frac{\delta}{4} > 0.$$

Using (8.5) estimate I (disregard the second term in the parenthesis) as

$$I \le A\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^\Gamma \rho^{(\beta-1)\Gamma} = \frac{A}{\rho^\Gamma}\left(\frac{\varepsilon\beta\rho^\beta}{32R^\beta}\right)^\Gamma \le 2^\Gamma A\left(\frac{\beta}{32}\right)^\Gamma \frac{\varepsilon^\Gamma}{R^\Gamma}.$$

Next, $\psi_t(y,s) = \alpha\eta s^{\alpha-1}/\tau^\alpha \ge \alpha\eta\hat\tau^{\alpha-1}/\tau^\alpha$ implying that

$$I - f(\phi(y,s))\psi_t(y,s) \le 2^\Gamma A\left(\frac{\beta}{32}\right)^\Gamma \frac{\varepsilon^\Gamma}{R^\Gamma} - \alpha m\eta(\hat\tau^{\alpha-1}/\tau^\alpha) < 0,$$

if R is chosen large enough. Using (8.5), we get a contradiction and $\phi \le \ell$ in $\Omega_{\hat\tau,\tau}$.

If $\sup_{\Omega_T}\phi > \sup_{P_T}\phi$ then there is a point $(y,s) \in \Omega_T$ (with $0 < s < T$) such that $\phi(y,s) > \sup_{P_T}\phi$. Select $0 < \hat s < s < \bar s < T$ and call P the parabolic boundary of $\Omega_{\hat s,\bar s}$. Then, $\sup_{P_T}\phi < \phi(y,s) \le \sup_{\Omega_{\hat s,\bar s}}\phi \le \sup_P \phi \le \sup_{P_T}\phi$. This is a contradiction and the lemma holds.

To show the weak minimum principle, take $v = -\phi$ and conclude that $H(-Dv, -D^2v) \le f(-v)(-v_t)$. If $\hat f(v) = f(-v)$ then (1.3) shows that $\hat H(Dv, D^2v) \ge \tilde f(v)v_t$. As noted in Remark 1.9, $\hat H$ satisfies Conditions A, B and C and the minimum principle follows. □

Finally, we comment that if u solves $H(Du, D^2u) + \chi(t)|Du|^\Gamma - f(u)u_t = g(x,t)$, where $\sup_{\Omega_T}|g| < \infty$ and $m = \inf_{I\!R} f > 0$, then by using $u \pm \ell t$, $\ell \ge L/m$ large, one gets $\inf_{P_T} u + \ell(t-T) \le u \le \sup_{P_T} u + \ell t$.

References

[1] T. Bhattacharya and L. Marazzi, *On the viscosity solutions to a degenerate parabolic differential equation,* Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, vol 194, no 5, 2014, DOI:10.1007/s10231-014-0427-1

[2] T. Bhattacharya and L. Marazzi, *On the viscosity solutions to Trudinger's equation.* Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications (NoDEA), vol 22, no 5, 2015, DOI:10.1007/s00030-015-0315-4

[3] T. Bhattacharya and L. Marazzi, *Asymptotics of viscosity solutions to some doubly nonlinear parabolic equations ,* In press. J. Evol. Eqns. 10.1007/s00028-015-0319-x

[4] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii and P. L. Lions, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations,*Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 27(1992) 1-67.

[5] F. Demengel, *Existence results for parabolic problems related to fully non linear operators degenerate or singular,* Pot. Anal. 35(2011), no 1, 1-38.

[6] DiBenedetto, *Degenerate Parabolic Equations,* Universitext, Springer (1993)

[7] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order,* Springer, 1998 Edition, Classics in Mathematics.

[8] B. Kawohl and P. Juutinen, *On the evolution equation governed by the Infinity-Laplacian,* Math. Ann. 335 (2006) no 4, 819-851.

[9] N. S. Trudinger, *Pointwise estimates and quasilinear parabolic equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 21(1968), 205-226

Department of Mathematics Western Kentucky University Bowling Green, Ky 42101

Department of Liberal Arts Savannah College of Arts and Design Savannah, Ga 31401